arXiv:1408.4877v2 [math.AP] 10 Jun 2015

n-Kirchhoff type equations with exponential nonlinearities

Sarika Goyal[*], **Pawan Kumar Mishra**[†] and **K. Sreenadh**[‡]

Department of Mathematics,

Indian Institute of Technology Delhi

Hauz Khas, New Delhi-16, India

Abstract

In this article, we study the existence of non-negative solutions of the class of non-local problem of n-Kirchhoff type

$$\begin{cases} -m(\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^n)\Delta_n u = f(x,u) \text{ in } \Omega, \quad u = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a bounded domain with smooth boundary, $n \geq 2$ and f behaves like $e^{|u|^{\frac{n}{n-1}}}$ as $|u| \to \infty$. Moreover, by minimization on the suitable subset of the Nehari manifold, we study the existence and multiplicity of solutions, when $f(x,t)$ is concave near $t = 0$ and convex as $t \to \infty$.

Key words: Kirchhoff equation, Trudinger-Moser embedding, sign-changing weight function.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 35J35, 35J60, 35J92

[*]email: sarika1.iitd@gmail.com

[†]email: pawanmishra31284@gmail.com,

[‡]e-mail: sreenadh@gmail.com

1 Introduction

The aim of this article is to study the existence of positive solutions of following n-Kirchhoff type equation

$$(\mathcal{M}) \quad \begin{cases} -m(\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^n)\Delta_n u &= f(x,u) \text{ in } \Omega, \\ u &= 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a bounded domain with smooth boundary, $m : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}^+$ and $f : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ are continuous functions that satisfy some conditions which will be stated later on.

We also study the existence of non-negative solutions of the following n-Kirchhoff problem

$$(\mathcal{P}_{\lambda,M}) \quad \begin{cases} -m(\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^n)\Delta_n u &= \lambda h(x)|u|^{q-1}u + u|u|^p\ e^{|u|^\beta} \text{ in } \Omega \\ u &= 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a bounded domain with smooth boundary, $n \geq 2$, $0 < q < n-1 < 2n-1 < p+1$, $\beta \in \left(1, \frac{n}{n-1}\right]$ and $\lambda > 0$. By minimization on the suitable subset of the Nehari manifold we show the existence and multiplicity of solutions with respect to the parameter λ.

The above problems are called non-local because of the presence of the term $m(\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^n)$ which implies that the equations in $(\mathcal{M})$ and $(\mathcal{P}_{\lambda,M})$ are no longer a pointwise identity. This phenomenon causes some mathematical difficulties which makes the study of such a class of problem interesting. Basically, the presence of $\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^n$ as the coefficient of $\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^{n-2}\nabla u \nabla \phi$ in the weak formulation makes the study of compactness of Palais-Smale sequences difficult. The study of elliptic equations with exponential growth nonlinearities are motivated by the following Trudinger-Moser inequality [27], namely

Theorem 1.1 *For $n \geq 2$, $u \in W_0^{1,n}(\Omega)$*

$$\sup_{\|u\| \leq 1} \int_\Omega e^{\alpha |u|^{\frac{n}{n-1}}} dx < \infty \tag{1.1}$$

if and only if $\alpha \leq \alpha_n$, where $\alpha_n = n w_{n-1}^{\frac{1}{n-1}}$, $w_{n-1} =$ volume of $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$.

The embedding $W_0^{1,n}(\Omega) \ni u \longmapsto e^{|u|^\beta} \in L^1(\Omega)$ is compact for all $\beta \in \left(1, \frac{n}{n-1}\right)$ and is continuous for $\beta = \frac{n}{n-1}$. The non-compactness of the embedding can be shown using a sequence of functions that are truncations and dilations of fundamental solution of $-\Delta_n$ on $W_0^{1,n}(\Omega)$. The existence results for quasilinear problems with exponential terms on bounded domains was initiated and studied by Adimurthi [1].

Starting from the pioneering works of Tarantello [29] and Ambrosetti-Brezis-Cerami [6], a lot of work has been done to address the multiplicity of positive solutions for semilinear and quasilinear elliptic problems with positive nonlinearities. Recently, many works are devoted

to the study of these multiplicity results with polynomial type nonlinearity with sign-changing weight functions using the Nehari manifold and fibering map analysis (see refs.[29, 17, 30, 31, 32, 8, 5, 18]). In [9], authors studied the existence of multiple positive solution of Kirchhoff type problem with convex-concave polynomial type nonlinearities having subcritical growth by Nehari manifold and fibering map methods. In addition, the corresponding results of the Kirchhoff type problem can be found in [3, 4, 10, 11, 12, 14, 19, 22, 23, 24] and references therein.
The boundary value problems involving Kirchhoff equations arise in several physical and biological systems. These type of non-local problems were initially observed by Kirchhoff in 1883 in the study of string or membrane vibrations to describe the transversal oscillations of a stretched string, particularly, taking into account the subsequent change in string length caused by oscillations.

In this paper, first we discuss the Adimurthi [1] type existence result for the n-Kirchhoff problem in $(\mathcal{M})$ with nonlinearity $f(x,u)$ that has superlinear growth near zero and exponential growth near ∞. To prove our result we follow the approach as in [19]. In our case, the operator $-\Delta_n$ is not linear, so we required to prove the pointwise convergence of gradients of Palais-Smale sequences. Moreover due to Kirchhoff operator we need the norm convergence of Palais-Smale sequence to show that weak limit is a solution. We used concentration compactness principle to show this convergence. In the second part, we discuss the n-Kirchhoff problem in $(\mathcal{P}_{\lambda,M})$ with sign-changing and exponential type nonlinearity to obtain the multiplicity of solutions with respect to the parameter λ. We show the multiplicity result by extracting Palais-Smale sequences in the Nehari manifold. The results obtained here are some how expected but we show how the results arise out of nature of Nehari manifold.

The paper is organized as follows: In section 2, we consider the critical problem with positive nonlinearity and prove Adimurthi's type [1] existence result. In section 3, we study the problem with convex-concave sign-changing nonlinearity by Nehari manifold approach and show the existence of two solutions that arise from the nature of the Nehari manifold.

We shall throughout use the following notations: The norm on $W_0^{1,n}(\Omega)$ and $L^p(\Omega)$ are denoted by $\|\cdot\|$, $\|u\|_p$ respectively. The weak convergence is denoted by $\rightharpoonup$ and $\to$ denotes strong convergence.

2 Existence of positive solutions with positive nonlinearity

In this section, we prove the existence result for the problem

$$(\mathcal{M}) - m(\|u\|^n)\Delta_n u = f(x,u) \text{ in } \Omega, \qquad u = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega,$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a bounded domain with smooth boundary, $m : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}^+$ and $f : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ are continuous functions that satisfy the following assumptions:

$(m1)$ There exists $m_0 > 0$ such that $m(t) \geq m_0$ for all $t \geq 0$ and

$$M(t+s) \geq M(t) + M(s) \text{ for all } s, t \geq 0,$$

where $M(t) = \int_0^t m(s)ds$, the primitive of m so that $M(0) = 0$.

$(m2)$ There exist constants a_1, $a_2 > 0$ and $t_0 > 0$ such that for some $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$

$$m(t) \leq a_1 + a_2 t^\sigma, \text{ for all } t \geq t_0.$$

$(m3)$ $\frac{m(t)}{t}$ is nonincreasing for $t > 0$.

The condition $(m1)$ is valid whenever $m(0) = m_0$ and m is nondecreasing. A typical example of a function m satisfying the conditions $(m1) - (m3)$ is $m(t) = m_0 + at^\alpha$, where $m_0 > 0$, $a \geq 0$ and $\alpha > 0$. Another example is $m(t) = 1 + \log(1+t)$ for $t \geq 0$.
From $(m3)$, we can easily deduce that

$$\frac{1}{n}M(t) - \frac{1}{\theta}m(t)t \text{ is nondecreasing for } t \geq 0 \text{ and } \theta \geq 2n.$$

In particular, one has

$$\frac{1}{n}M(t) - \frac{1}{\theta}m(t)t \geq 0 \text{ for all } t \geq 0 \text{ and } \theta \geq 2n. \tag{2.1}$$

The nonlinearity $f(x,t) = h(x,t)e^{|t|^{n/n-1}}$, where $h(x,t)$ satisfies

$(f1)$ $h \in C^1(\overline{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R})$, $h(x,0) = 0$, for all $t \leq 0$, $h(x,t) > 0$, for all $t > 0$ and $\lim_{t\to 0} \frac{h(x,t)}{|t|^n} = 0$.

$(f2)$ For any $\epsilon > 0$, $\lim\limits_{t\to\infty} \sup\limits_{x\in\overline{\Omega}} h(x,t)e^{-\epsilon|t|^{n/n-1}} = 0$, $\lim\limits_{t\to\infty} \inf\limits_{x\in\overline{\Omega}} h(x,t)e^{\epsilon|t|^{n/n-1}} = \infty$.

$(f3)$ There exist positive constants t_0, $K_0 > 0$ such that

$$F(x,t) \leq K_0 f(x,t) \text{ for all } (x,t) \in \Omega \times [t_0, +\infty).$$

$(f4)$ For each $x \in \Omega$, $\dfrac{f(x,t)}{t^{2n-1}}$ is increasing for $t > 0$ and $\lim\limits_{t\to 0^+} \dfrac{f(x,t)}{t^{2n-1}} = 0$, uniformly in $x \in \Omega$.

$(f5)$ $\lim\limits_{t\to\infty} th(x,t) = \infty$.

Assumption $(f3)$ implies that $F(x,t) \geq F(x,t_0)e^{\frac{1}{K_0}(t-t_0)}$, for all $(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times [t_0, \infty)$ which is a reasonable condition for function behaving as $e^{\alpha_0|t|^{n/n-1}}$ at ∞. Moreover from $(f3)$ it follows that for each $\theta > 0$, there exists $R_\theta > 0$ satisfying

$$\theta F(x,t) \leq tf(x,t) \text{ for all } (x,t) \in \Omega \times [R_\theta, \infty). \tag{2.2}$$

We also have that condition $(f4)$ implies that for $\mu \in [0, 2n-1)$,

$$\lim_{t\to 0^+} \frac{f(x,t)}{t^\mu} = 0, \text{ uniformly in } \ x \in \Omega. \tag{2.3}$$

Generally, the main difficulty encountered in non-local Kirchhoff problems is the competition between the growths of m and f. Here we generalize the result of [19] to the n-Kirchhoff equation.

Definition 2.1 *We say that $u \in W_0^{1,n}(\Omega)$ is a weak solution of $(\mathcal{M})$ if holds*

$$m(\|u\|^n)\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^{n-2}\nabla u \nabla \phi \ dx = \int_\Omega f(x,u)\phi \ dx \ \text{ for all } \ \phi \in W_0^{1,n}(\Omega).$$

The energy functional $J : W_0^{1,n}(\Omega) \to \mathbb{R}$ corresponding to the problem $(\mathcal{M})$ is defined as

$$J(u) = \frac{1}{n}M(\|u\|^n) - \int_\Omega F(x,u) \ dx.$$

Then the functional J is Fréchet differentiable and the critical points are the weak solutions of $(\mathcal{M})$. We prove the following Theorem in this section:

Theorem 2.2 *Suppose $(m1)-(m3)$ and $(f1)-(f3)$ are satisfied. Then, problem $(\mathcal{M})$ has a positive solution.*

We prove this Theorem by mountain pass Lemma. In the next few Lemmas we studied the mountain pass structure and Palais-Smale sequence to the functional J.

Lemma 2.3 *Assume the conditions $(m1)$, $(f1)-(f3)$ hold. Then J satisfies mountain-pass geometry around the 0.*

Proof. From the assumptions, $(f1)-(f3)$, for $\epsilon > 0$, $r > n$, there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$|F(x,t)| \le \epsilon|t|^n + C|t|^r e^{|t|^{n/n-1}}, \ \text{ for all } (x,t) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}.$$

Therefore, using Sobolev and Hölder inequalities, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega F(x,u)dx &\le \epsilon\int_\Omega |u|^n dx + C\int_\Omega |u|^r e^{|u|^{n/n-1}}dx \\ &\le \epsilon C_1\|u\|^n + C\|u\|_{2r}^r\left(\int_\Omega e^{2\|u\|^{n/n-1}(\frac{u}{\|u\|})^{n/n-1}}\right)^{1/2} \\ &\le \epsilon C_1\|u\|^n + C_2\|u\|^r\end{aligned}$$

for $\|u\| < R_1$, where $R_1 \le \left(\frac{\alpha_n}{2}\right)^{\frac{n-1}{n}}$, thanks to Moser-Trudinger inequality (1.1). Hence

$$J(u) \ge \|u\|^n\left(\frac{m_0}{n} - \epsilon C_1 - C_2\|u\|^{r-n}\right).$$

Since $r > n$, we can choose ϵ, $0 < R \leq R_1$ small such that $J(u) \geq \tau$ for some τ on $\|u\| = R$. Now by (2.2), for $\theta > \max\{n, n(\sigma+1)\}$, there exist C_1, $C_2 > 0$ such that

$$F(x,t) \geq C_1 t^\theta - C_2 \text{ for all } (x,t) \in \Omega \times [0, +\infty) \tag{2.4}$$

and for all $t \geq t_0$ condition $(m2)$ implies that

$$M(t) \leq \begin{cases} a_0 + a_1 t + \frac{a_2}{\sigma+1} t^{\sigma+1}, & \text{if } \sigma \neq -1, \\ b_0 + a_1 t + a_2 \ln t & \text{if } \sigma = -1, \end{cases} \tag{2.5}$$

where $a_0 = M(t_0) - a_1 t_0 - a_2 t_0^{\sigma+1}/(\sigma+1)$ and $b_0 = M(t_0) - a_1 t_0 - a_2 \ln t_0$. Now, choose a function $\phi_0 \in W_0^{1,n}(\Omega)$ with $\phi_0 \geq 0$ and $\|\phi_0\| = 1$. Then from (2.4) and (2.5), for all $t \geq t_0$, we obtain

$$J(t\phi_0) \leq \begin{cases} \frac{a_0}{n} + \frac{a_1}{n} t^n + \frac{a_2}{n\sigma+n} t^{n\sigma+n} - C_1 t^\theta \|\phi_0\|_\theta^\theta + C_2|\Omega|, & \text{if } \sigma \neq -1, \\ \frac{b_0}{n} + \frac{a_1}{n} t^n + \frac{a_2}{n} \ln t - C_1 t^\theta \|\phi_0\|_\theta^\theta + C_2|\Omega| & \text{if } \sigma = -1, \end{cases}$$

from which we conclude that $J(tu_0) \to -\infty$ as $t \to +\infty$ provided that $\theta > \max\{n, n\sigma + n\}$. Therefore, J satisfies mountain-pass geometry near 0. □

Lemma 2.4 *Every Palais-Smale sequence of J is bounded in $W_0^{1,n}(\Omega)$.*

Proof. Let $\{u_k\} \subset W_0^{1,n}(\Omega)$ be a Palais-Smale sequence for J at level c, that is

$$\frac{1}{n} M(\|u_k\|^n) - \int_\Omega F(x, u_k) \to c \tag{2.6}$$

and for all $\phi \in W_0^{1,n}(\Omega)$

$$\left| -m(\|u_k\|^n) \int_\Omega |\nabla u_k|^{n-2} \nabla u_k \nabla \phi dx - \int_\Omega f(x, u_k)\phi dx \right| \leq \epsilon_k \|\phi\| \tag{2.7}$$

where $\epsilon_k \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$. From (2.1), (2.2), (2.6) and (2.7), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} C + \|u_k\| &\geq \frac{1}{n} M(\|u_k\|^n) - \frac{1}{\theta} m(\|u_k\|^n)\|u_k\|^n \\ &\quad - \int_\Omega \left(F(x, u_k) - \frac{1}{\theta} f(x, u_k) u_k \right) \\ &\geq \left(\frac{1}{2n} - \frac{1}{\theta} \right) m(\|u_k\|^n)\|u_k\|^n. \end{aligned}$$

From this and taking $\theta > 2n$, we obtain the boundedness of the sequence. □

Let $\Gamma = \{\gamma \in C([0,1], W_0^{1,n}(\Omega)) : \gamma(0) = 0, J(\gamma(1)) < 0\}$ and define the mountain-pass level $c_* = \inf_{\gamma\in\Gamma} \max_{t\in[0,1]} J(\gamma(t))$. Then we have,

Lemma 2.5 *$c_* < \frac{1}{n}M(\alpha_n^{n-1})$, where $\alpha_n = n w_{n-1}^{\frac{1}{n-1}}$, w_{n-1} = volume of $n-1$ dimensional unit sphere in $\mathbb{R}^n$.*

Proof. Let $\delta_k > 0$ be such that $\delta_k \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$ and let $\phi_k(x)$ be the sequence of Moser functions defined by

$$\phi_k(x) = \frac{1}{w_{n-1}^{\frac{1}{n}}} \begin{cases} (\log k)^{\frac{n-1}{n}} & 0 \le \frac{|x|}{\delta_k} \le \frac{1}{k}; \\ \frac{\log \frac{\delta_k}{|x|}}{(\log k)^{\frac{1}{n}}} & \frac{1}{k} \le \frac{|x|}{\delta_k} \le 1; \\ 0 & \frac{|x|}{\delta_k} \ge 1, \end{cases} \tag{2.8}$$

with support in $B_{\delta_k}(0) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$. It can be easily seen that $\|\nabla\phi_k\|_n = 1$ for all k. Suppose the result is not true, i.e. $c_* \ge \frac{1}{n}M(\alpha_n^{n-1})$. Then for each k, there exists t_k such that

$$\sup_{t>0} J(t\phi_k) = J(t_k\phi_k) = \frac{1}{n}M(\|t_k\phi_k\|^n) - \int_\Omega F(x, t_k\phi_k) \ge \frac{1}{n}M(\alpha_n^{n-1}). \tag{2.9}$$

From (2.9), we see that t_k is a bounded sequence as $J(t_k\phi_k) \to -\infty$ as $t_k \to \infty$. Also using M is monotone increasing and $F(x, t_k\phi_k) \ge 0$ in (2.9), we obtain

$$t_k^n \ge \alpha_n^{n-1}. \tag{2.10}$$

Now since t_k is a point of maximum for one dimensional map $t \mapsto J(t\phi_k)$, we have $\frac{d}{dt}J(t\phi_k)|_{t=t_k} = 0$. From this it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} m(t_k^n\|\phi_k\|^n)t_k^n\|\phi_k\|^n &= \int_\Omega f(x, t_k\phi_k)t_k\phi_k \ge \int_{B_{\frac{\delta_k}{k}}(0)} f(x, t_k\phi_k)t_k\phi_k \\ &= \phi_k(0)t_k h(x, t_k\phi_k(0))\frac{(\delta_k)^n}{k^n}.k^n \\ &= \frac{t_k}{w_{n-1}^{\frac{1}{n}}}(\log k)^{\frac{n-1}{n}-\frac{1}{\alpha}}h(x, t_k\phi_k(0)). \end{aligned} \tag{2.11}$$

Now we choose $\delta_k = (\log k)^{\frac{-1}{\alpha n}}$, with $\alpha > \frac{n}{n-1}$. Then $(f5)$ implies that the right hand side of (2.11) tends to ∞. Which is a contradiction as the left side of (2.11) is bounded. Hence $c_* < \frac{1}{n}M(\alpha_n^{n-1})$. □

In order to prove that a Palais-Smale sequence converges to a solution of problem $(\mathcal{M})$ we need the following convergence Lemma. We refer to Lemma 2.1 in [16] for a proof.

Lemma 2.6 *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded domain and $f : \overline{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ a continuous function. Then for any sequence $\{u_k\}$ in $L^1(\Omega)$ such that*

$$u_k \to u \text{ in } L^1(\Omega), \quad f(x, u_k) \in L^1(\Omega) \text{ and } \int_\Omega |f(x, u_k)u_k| \le C,$$

we have up to a subsequence $f(x, u_k) \to f(x, u)$ and $F(x, u_k) \to F(x, u)$ strongly in $L^1(\Omega)$.

Now we need the following Lemma, inspired by [26], to show that weak limit of a Palais-Smale sequence is a weak solution of $(\mathcal{M})$,

Lemma 2.7 *For any Palais-Smale sequence $\{u_k\}$, there exists a subsequence still denoted by $\{u_k\}$ and $u \in W_0^{1,n}(\Omega)$ such that $f(x,u_k) \to f(x,u)$ in $L^1(\Omega)$ and $|\nabla u_k|^{n-2}\nabla u_k \rightharpoonup |\nabla u|^{n-2}\nabla u$ weakly in $(L^{n/n-1}(\Omega))^n$.*

Proof. From Lemma 2.4, we obtain that $\{u_k\}$ is bounded in $W_0^{1,n}(\Omega)$. Consequently, up to a subsequence $u_k \rightharpoonup u$ weakly in $W_0^{1,n}(\Omega)$, $u_k \to u$ strongly in $L^q(\Omega)$ for all $q \in [1,\infty)$ and $u_k(x) \to u(x)$ a.e in Ω. Then using the fact that $\{u_k\}$ is a bounded sequence together with (2.7) and Lemma 2.6, we obtain $f(x,u_k) \to f(x,u)$ in $L^1(\Omega)$.
Now to show that $|\nabla u_k|^{n-2}\nabla u_k \rightharpoonup |\nabla u|^{n-2}\nabla u$ weakly in $(L^{n/n-1}(\Omega))^n$. First, we note that $\{|\nabla u_k|^{n-2}\nabla u_k\}$ is bounded in $L^{\frac{n}{n-1}}(\Omega)$. Then, without loss of generality, we may assume that

$$|\nabla u_k|^n \longrightarrow \mu \text{ in } D'(\Omega) \text{ and } |\nabla u_k|^{n-2}\nabla u_k \rightharpoonup \nu \text{ weakly in } L^{\frac{n}{n-1}}(\Omega), \tag{2.12}$$

where μ is a non-negative regular measure and $D'(\Omega)$ are the distributions on Ω.
Let $\sigma > 0$ and $\mathcal{A}_\sigma = \{x \in \overline{\Omega} : \forall\ r > 0, \mu(B_r(x) \cap \overline{\Omega}) \geq \sigma\}$. We claim that A_σ is a finite set. Suppose by contradiction that there exists a sequence of distinct points (x_s) in $\mathcal{A}_\sigma$. Since for all $r > 0$, $\mu(B_r(x_s) \cap \overline{\Omega}) \geq \sigma$, we have that $\mu(\{x_s\}) \geq \sigma$. This implies that $\mu(\mathcal{A}_\sigma) = +\infty$, however

$$\mu(\mathcal{A}_\sigma) = \lim_{k\to+\infty} \int_{\mathcal{A}_\sigma} |\nabla u_k|^n dx \leq C.$$

Thus $\mathcal{A}_\sigma = \{x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_p\}$.
Assertion 1. If we choose $\sigma > 0$ such that $\sigma^{\frac{1}{n-1}} < r_1$, then we have

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \int_K f(x,u_k)u_k\ dx = \int_K f(x,u)u\ dx,$$

for any relative compact subset K of $\overline{\Omega} \setminus \mathcal{A}_\sigma$.
Indeed, let $x_0 \in K$ and $r_0 > 0$ be such that $\mu(\mathbf{B}_{r_0}(x_0) \cap \overline{\Omega}) < \sigma$. Consider a function $\phi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega, [0,1])$ such that $\phi \equiv 1$ in $\mathbf{B}_{\frac{r_0}{2}}(x_0) \cap \overline{\Omega}$ and $\phi \equiv 0$ in $\overline{\Omega} \setminus (\mathbf{B}_{r_0}(x_0) \cap \overline{\Omega})$. Thus

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \int_{\mathbf{B}_{r_0}(x_0)\cap\overline{\Omega}} |\nabla u_k|^n \phi\ dx = \int_{\mathbf{B}_{r_0}(x_0)\cap\overline{\Omega}} \phi d\mu \leq \mu(\mathbf{B}_{r_0}(x_0) \cap \overline{\Omega}) < \sigma.$$

Therefore for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ sufficiently large and $\epsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, we have

$$\int_{\mathbf{B}_{\frac{r_0}{2}}(x_0)\cap\overline{\Omega}} |\nabla u_k|^n\ dx = \int_{\mathbf{B}_{\frac{r_0}{2}}(x_0)\cap\overline{\Omega}} |\nabla u_k|^n \phi dx \leq (1-\epsilon)\sigma,$$

which together with implies

$$\int_{\mathbf{B}_{\frac{r_0}{2}}(x_0)\cap\overline{\Omega}} |f(x,u_k)|^q = \int_{\mathbf{B}_{\frac{r_0}{2}}(x_0)\cap\overline{\Omega}} |h(x,u_k)|^q e^{q|u_k|^{\frac{n}{n-1}}} \leq d \int_{\mathbf{B}_{\frac{r_0}{2}}(x_0)\cap\overline{\Omega}} e^{(1+\delta)q|u_k|^{\frac{n}{n-1}}} \leq K \tag{2.13}$$

if we choose $q > 1$ sufficiently close to 1 and $\delta > 0$ is small enough such that $\frac{(1+\delta)q\sigma^{\frac{1}{n-1}}}{r_1} < 1$. Now we estimate

$$\int_{\mathbf{B}_{\frac{r_0}{2}}(x_0)\cap\overline{\Omega}} |f(x,u_k)u_k - f(x,u)u|\ dx \leq I_1 + I_2$$

where

$$I_1 := \int_{\mathbf{B}_{\frac{r_0}{2}}(x_0)\cap\overline{\Omega}} |f(x,u_k) - f(x,u)||u|dx \text{ and } I_2 := \int_{\mathbf{B}_{\frac{r_0}{2}}(x_0)\cap\overline{\Omega}} |f(x,u_k)||u_k - u|\ dx.$$

Note that, by Hölder's inequality and (2.13),

$$I_2 = \int_{\mathbf{B}_{\frac{r_0}{2}}(x_0)\cap\overline{\Omega}} |f(x,u_k)||u_k - u|dx \leq K\left(\int_\Omega |u_k - u|^{q'}\right)^{1/q'} \to 0 \text{ as } k \to \infty.$$

Now, we claim that $I_1 \to 0$. Indeed, given $\epsilon > 0$, by density we can take $\phi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ such that $\|u - \phi\|_{q'} < \epsilon$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbf{B}_{\frac{r_0}{2}}(x_0)\cap\overline{\Omega}} |f(x,u_k) - f(x,u)||u| \leq &\int_{\mathbf{B}_{\frac{r_0}{2}}(x_0)\cap\overline{\Omega}} (|f(x,u_k)||u-\phi| + |f(x,u_k) - f(x,u)||\phi|)\\ &+ \int_{\mathbf{B}_{\frac{r_0}{2}}(x_0)\cap\overline{\Omega}} |f(x,u)||\phi - u|.\end{aligned}$$

Applying Hölder inequality and using equation (2.13) , we have

$$\int_{\mathbf{B}_{\frac{r_0}{2}}(x_0)\cap\overline{\Omega}} |f(x,u_k)||u-\phi|\ dx \leq \left(\int_{\mathbf{B}_{\frac{r_0}{2}}(x_0)\cap\overline{\Omega}} |f(x,u_k)|^q dx\right)^{1/q} \|u-\phi\|_{q'} < \epsilon.$$

Using Lemma 2.6, we have

$$\int_{\mathbf{B}_{\frac{r_0}{2}}(x_0)\cap\overline{\Omega}} |f(x,u_k) - f(x,u)||\phi|\ dx \leq \|\phi\|_\infty \int_{\mathbf{B}_{\frac{r_0}{2}}(x_0)\cap\overline{\Omega}} |f(x,u_k) - f(x,u)|dx \to 0.$$

Also from equation (2.13), we have $\int_{\mathbf{B}_{\frac{r_0}{2}}(x_0)\cap\overline{\Omega}} |f(x,u)||\phi - u|dx \to 0$, and hence the claim. Now to conclude Assertion 1 we use that K is compact and we repeat the same procedure over a finite covering of balls.

Assertion 2: Let $\epsilon_0 > 0$ be such that $B_{\epsilon_0}(x_i) \cap B_{\epsilon_0}(x_j) = \emptyset$ if $i \neq j$ and $\Omega_{\epsilon_0} = \{x \in \bar{\Omega} : |x - x_j| \geq \epsilon_0, j = 1, 2, ..., m\}$. Then

$$\int_{\Omega_{\epsilon_0}} (|\nabla u_k|^{n-2}\nabla u_k - |\nabla u|^{n-2}\nabla u)(\nabla u_k - \nabla u) \to 0. \tag{2.14}$$

Indeed, let $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$ and $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $\phi \equiv 1$ in $B_{1/2}(0)$ and $\phi \equiv 0$ in $\bar{\Omega} \setminus B_1(0)$. Take $\psi_\epsilon = 1 - \sum_{j=1}^m \phi\left(\frac{x - x_j}{\epsilon}\right)$. Then $0 \leq \psi_\epsilon \leq 1$, $\psi_\epsilon \equiv 1$ in $\bar{\Omega}_\epsilon = \bar{\Omega} \setminus \cup_{j=1}^m B_\epsilon(x_j)$, $\psi_\epsilon \equiv 0$ in $\cup_{j=1}^m B_{\epsilon/2}(x_j)$ and $\{\psi_\epsilon u_k\}$ is bounded in $W_0^{1,n}(\Omega)$. Now taking $v = \psi_\epsilon u_k$ in (2.7) we get

$$m(\|u_k\|^n)\int_\Omega \left[|\nabla u_k|^n\psi_\epsilon + |\nabla u_k|^{n-2}\nabla u_k\nabla\psi_\epsilon u_k\right] - \int_\Omega f(x,u_k)u_k\psi_\epsilon \leq \epsilon_k\|\psi_\epsilon u_k\|. \tag{2.15}$$

Again taking $v = -\psi_\epsilon u$ in (2.7) we get

$$m(\|u_k\|^n)\int_\Omega \left[-|\nabla u_k|^{n-2}\nabla u_k \nabla u \psi_\epsilon - |\nabla u_k|^{n-2}\ \nabla u_k \nabla \psi_\epsilon u\right] + \int_\Omega f(x,u_k)u\psi_\epsilon \leq \epsilon_k \|\psi_\epsilon u\|. \tag{2.16}$$

Also using the convexity of $t \mapsto |t|^n$ for $t \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $m(t) \geq m_0 > 0$, we have

$$0 \leq m(\|u_k\|^n)\int_\Omega \left(|\nabla u_k|^n - |\nabla u_k|^{n-2}\nabla u_k \nabla u - |\nabla u|^{n-2}\nabla u \nabla u_k + |\nabla u|^n\right)\psi_\epsilon, \tag{2.17}$$

from (2.15), (2.16) and (2.17) we get

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq m(\|u_k\|^n)\int_\Omega |\nabla u_k|^{n-2}\nabla u_k \nabla \psi_\epsilon (u_k - u) + 2\epsilon_k \|\psi_\epsilon u_k\| \\ + m(\|u_k\|^n)\int_\Omega \psi_\epsilon |\nabla u|^{n-2}\nabla u(\nabla u - \nabla u_k) + \int_\Omega f(x,u_k)(u_k - u)\psi_\epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Now as by Young's inequality, for given $\delta > 0$, there exists $C_\delta > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} m(\|u_k\|^n)\int_\Omega |\nabla u_k|^{n-2}\nabla u_k \nabla \psi_\epsilon (u_k - u) &\leq \delta \int_\Omega |\nabla u_k|^n + C_\delta \int_\Omega |\nabla \psi_\epsilon|^n |u_k - u|^n \\ &\leq \delta C + C_\delta \Big(\int_\Omega |\nabla \psi_\epsilon|^{nr}\Big)^{1/r}\Big(\int_\Omega |u_k - u|^{ns}\Big)^{1/s} \end{aligned} \tag{2.18}$$

where C, r and s are positive real number such that $\dfrac{1}{r} + \dfrac{1}{s} = 1$. Thus using this and boundedness of $\{u_k\}$, we get

$$\limsup_{k\to\infty} m(\|u_k\|^n)\int_\Omega |\nabla u_k|^{n-2}\nabla u_k \nabla \psi_\epsilon (u_k - u) \leq 0. \tag{2.19}$$

Also noting that $u_k \rightharpoonup u$ weakly in $W_0^{1,n}(\Omega)$ and $m(\|u_k\|^n)$ bounded, we have

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} m(\|u_k\|^n)\int_\Omega \psi_\epsilon |\nabla u|^{n-2}\nabla u(\nabla u - \nabla u_k) = 0. \tag{2.20}$$

By Assertion 1, taking $\mathcal{K} = \overline{\Omega}_{\epsilon/2}$ one can check that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\int_\Omega f(u_k)(u_k - u)\psi_\epsilon = 0. \tag{2.21}$$

Now from (2.18)-(2.21), (2.14) follows. Since ϵ_0 is arbitrary, we get $\nabla u_k(x) \to \nabla u(x)$ a.e in Ω and hence $|\nabla u_k|^{n-2}\nabla u_k \rightharpoonup |\nabla u|^{n-2}\nabla u$ weakly in $(L^{n/n-1}(\Omega))^n$. □

Now we define the Nehari manifold associated to the functional J, as

$$\mathcal{N} := \{0 \not\equiv u \in W_0^{1,n}(\Omega) : \langle J'(u), u\rangle = 0\}$$

and let $b := \inf_{u\in\mathcal{N}} J(u)$. Then we need the following to compare c_* and b.

Lemma 2.8 *If condition* $(f1)$ *holds, then for each* $x \in \Omega$, $sf(x,s) - 2nF(x,s)$ *is increasing for* $s \geq 0$. *In particular* $sf(x,s) - 2nF(x,s) \geq 0$ *for all* $(x,s) \in \Omega \times [0,\infty)$.

Proof. Suppose $0 < s < t$. Then for each $x \in \Omega$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} sf(x,s) - 2nF(x,s) &= \frac{f(x,s)}{s^{2n-1}}s^{2n} - 2nF(x,t) + 2n\int_s^t f(x,\tau)d\tau \\ &< \frac{f(x,t)}{t^{2n-1}}s^{2n} - 2nF(x,t) + \frac{f(x,t)}{t^{2n-1}}(t^{2n} - s^{2n}) \\ &\leq tf(x,t) - 2nF(x,t), \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. □

Lemma 2.9 *: If (i)* $\frac{m(t)}{t}$ *is nonincreasing for* $t > 0$ *(ii) for each* $x \in \Omega$, $\frac{f(x,t)}{t^{2n-1}}$ *is increasing for* $t > 0$ *hold. Then* $c_* \leq b$.

Proof. Let $u \in \mathcal{N}$, define $h : (0,+\infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ by $h(t) = J(tu)$. Then

$$h'(t) = \langle J'(tu), u\rangle = m(t^n\|u\|^n)t^{n-1}\|u\|^n - \int_\Omega f(x,tu)u\,dx \text{ for all } t > 0.$$

Since $\langle J'(u), u\rangle = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} h'(t) =& \|u\|^n t^{2n-1}\left(\frac{m(t^n\|u\|^n)}{t^n\|u\|^n} - \frac{m(\|u\|^n)}{\|u\|^n}\right) \\ &+ t^{2n-1}\int_\Omega \left(\frac{f(x,u)}{u^{2n-1}} - \frac{f(x,tu)}{(tu)^{2n-1}}\right)u^{2n}dx. \end{aligned}$$

So $h'(1) = 0$, $h'(t) \geq 0$ for $0 < t < 1$ and $h'(t) < 0$ for $t > 1$. Hence $J(u) = \max\limits_{t\geq 0} J(tu)$. Now define $g : [0,1] \to W_0^{1,n}(\Omega)$ as $g(t) = (t_0u)t$, where t_0 is such that $J(t_0u) < 0$. We have $g \in \Gamma$ and therefore

$$c_* \leq \max_{t\in[0,1]} J(g(t)) \leq \max_{t\geq 0} J(tu) = J(u).$$

Since $u \in \mathcal{N}$ is arbitrary, $c_* \leq b$ and the proof is complete. □

We recall the following result of Lions [25] known as higher integrability Lemma.

Lemma 2.10 *Let* $\{v_k : \|v_k\| = 1\}$ *be a sequence in* $W_0^{1,n}(\Omega)$ *converging weakly to a non-zero* v. *Then for every* p *such that* $1 < p < (1 - \|v\|^n)^{\frac{-1}{n-1}}$,

$$\sup_k \int_\Omega e^{p\alpha_n|v_k|^{\frac{n}{n-1}}} < \infty.$$

Proof of Theorem 2.2: Let $\{u_k\}$ be a Palais-Smale sequence at level c_*. That is $J(u_k) \to c_*$ and $J'(u_k) \to 0$. Then by Lemma 2.4 and Lemma 2.7, there exists $u_0 \in W_0^{1,n}(\Omega)$ such that $u_k \rightharpoonup u_0$ weakly in $W_0^{1,n}(\Omega)$, $\nabla u_k(x) \to \nabla u_0(x)$ a.e. in Ω. Now we claim that u_0 is the required positive solution.

claim 1: $u_0 > 0$ in Ω.

Proof. As $\{u_k\}$ is bounded, so up to a subsequence $\|u_k\| \to \rho_0 > 0$. Moreover, condition $J'(u_k) \to 0$ and Lemma 2.7 implies that

$$m(\rho_0^n)\int_\Omega |\nabla u_0|^{n-2}\nabla u_0 \nabla v \, dx = \int_\Omega f(x,u_0)v \, dx \text{ for all } v \in W_0^{1,n}(\Omega). \tag{2.22}$$

That is u_0 satisfies $-\Delta_n u_0 = \frac{1}{m(\rho_0^n)} f(x,u_0)$ in Ω, $\quad u = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$. Using the growth condition of $f(x,t)$ and Trudinger-Moser inequality, we get $f(.,u_0) \in L^p(\Omega)$ for all $1 \le p \le \infty$. Therefore by regularity theory $u_0 \in C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$ and hence by strong maximum principle, we get $u_0 > 0$ in Ω and hence the claim.

claim 2: $m(\|u_0\|^n)\|u_0\|^n \ge \int_\Omega f(x,u_0)u_0 dx$.

Proof. Suppose by contradiction that $m(\|u_0\|^n)\|u_0\|^n < \int_\Omega f(x,u_0)u_0 \, dx$. That is, $\langle J'(u_0), u_0\rangle < 0$. Using (2.3) and Sobolev imbedding, we can see that $\langle J'(tu_0), u_0\rangle > 0$ for t sufficiently small. Thus there exist $\sigma \in (0,1)$ such that $\langle I'(\sigma u_0), u_0\rangle = 0$. That is, $\sigma u_0 \in \mathcal{N}$. Thus according to Lemma 2.8,

$$\begin{aligned} c_* \le b \le J(\sigma u_0) &= J(\sigma u_0) - \frac{1}{2n}\langle J'(\sigma u_0), \sigma u_0\rangle \\ &= \frac{M(\|\sigma u_0\|^n)}{n} - \frac{m(\|\sigma u_0\|^n)\|\sigma u_0\|^n}{2n} + \int_\Omega \frac{(f(x,\sigma u_0)\sigma u_0 - 2nF(x,\sigma u_0))}{2n} \\ &< \frac{1}{n}M(\|u_0\|^n) - \frac{1}{2n}m(\|u_0\|^n)\|u_0\|^n + \frac{1}{2n}\int_\Omega (f(x,u_0)u_0 - 2nF(x,u_0)) \end{aligned}$$

By lower semicontinuity of norm and Fatou's Lemma, we get

$$\begin{aligned} c_* &< \liminf_{k\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\left(M(\|u_k\|^n) - \frac{1}{2}m(\|u_k\|^n)\|u_k\|^n\right) \\ &\quad + \liminf_{k\to\infty} \frac{1}{2n}\int_\Omega [f(x,u_k)u_k - 2nF(x,u_k)]dx \\ &\le \lim_{k\to\infty}[J(u_k) - \frac{1}{2n}\langle J'(u_k), u_k\rangle] = c_*, \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction and the claim 2 is proved.

Claim 3: $J(u_0) = c_*$.

Proof. Using $\int_\Omega F(x,u_k) \to \int_\Omega F(x,u_0)$ and lower semicontinuity of norm we have $J(u_0) \le c_*$. We are going to show that the case $J(u_0) < c_*$ can not occur.

Indeed, if $J(u_0) < c_*$ then $\|u_0\|^n < \rho_0^n$. Moreover,

$$\frac{1}{n}M(\rho_0^n) = \lim_{k\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}M(\|u_k\|^n) = c_* + \int_\Omega F(x,u_0)dx, \tag{2.23}$$

which implies $\rho_0^n = M^{-1}(nc_* + n\int_\Omega F(x,u_0)dx)$. Next defining $v_k = \frac{u_k}{\|u_k\|}$ and $v_0 = \frac{u_0}{\rho_0}$, we have $v_k \rightharpoonup v_0$ in $W_0^{1,n}(\Omega)$ and $\|v_0\| < 1$. Thus by Lion's lemma 2.10,

$$\sup_{k\in\mathbb{N}}\int_\Omega e^{p|v_k|^{\frac{n}{n-1}}} \, dx < \infty \text{ for all } 1 < p < \frac{\alpha_n}{(1-\|v_0\|^n)^{\frac{1}{n-1}}}. \tag{2.24}$$

On the other hand, by Assertion 2, (2.1) and Lemma 2.8, we have

$$J(u_0) \geq \frac{M(\|u_0\|^2)}{n} - \frac{m(\|u_0\|^2)\|u_0\|^2}{2n} + \int_\Omega \frac{(f(x,u_0)u_0 - 2nF(x,u_0)}{2n}.$$

So, $J(u_0) \geq 0$. Using this together with Lemma 2.5 and the equality, $n(c_* - J(u_0)) = M(\rho_0^n) - M(\|u_0\|^n)$ we get $M(\rho_0^n) \leq nc_* + M(\|u_0\|^n) < M(\alpha_n^{n-1}) + M(\|u_0\|^n)$ and therefore by $(m1)$

$$\rho_0^n < M^{-1}\left(M(\alpha_{n-1}^n) + M(\|u_0\|^n)\right) \leq \alpha_n^{n-1} + \|u_0\|^n. \tag{2.25}$$

Since $\rho_0^n(1 - \|v_0\|^n) = \rho_0^n - \|u_0\|^n$, from (2.25) it follows that

$$\rho_0^n < \frac{\alpha_n^{n-1}}{1 - \|v_0\|^n}.$$

Thus, there exists $\beta > 0$ such that $\|u_k\|^{\frac{n}{n-1}} < \beta < \frac{\alpha_n}{(1-\|v_0\|^n)^{\frac{1}{n-1}}}$ for k large. We can choose $q > 1$ close to 1 such that $q\|u_k\|^{\frac{n}{n-1}} \leq \beta < \frac{\alpha_n}{(1-\|v_0\|^n)^{\frac{1}{n-1}}}$ and using (2.24), we conclude that for k large

$$\int_\Omega e^{q|u_k|^{n/n-1}} dx \leq \int_\Omega e^{\beta|v_k|^{n/n-1}} \leq C.$$

Now by standard calculations, using Hölder's inequality and weak convergence of $\{u_k\}$ to u_0, we get $\int_\Omega f(x,u_k)(u_k - u_0) \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$. Since $\langle J'(u_k), u_k - u_0\rangle \to 0$, it follows that

$$m(\|u_k\|^n) \int_\Omega |\nabla u_k|^{n-2}\nabla u_k(\nabla u_k - \nabla u_0) \to 0. \tag{2.26}$$

On the other hand, using $u_k \rightharpoonup u_0$ weakly and boundedness of $m(\|u_k\|^n)$,

$$m(\|u_k\|^n) \int_\Omega |\nabla u_0|^{n-2}\nabla u_0(\nabla u_k - \nabla u_0) \to 0 \text{ as } k \to \infty. \tag{2.27}$$

Subtracting (2.27) from (2.26), we get

$$m(\|u_k\|^n) \int_\Omega (|\nabla u_k|^{n-2}\nabla u_k - |\nabla u_0|^{n-2}\nabla u_0) \cdot (\nabla u_k - \nabla u_0) \to 0$$

as $k \to \infty$. Now using this and the following inequality

$$|a-b|^l \leq 2^{l-2}(|a|^{l-2}a - |b|^{l-2}b)(a-b) \text{ for all } a, b \in \mathbb{R}^n \text{ and } l \geq 2, \tag{2.28}$$

with $a = \nabla u_k$ and $b = \nabla u_0$, we obtain

$$m(\|u_k\|^n) \int_\Omega |\nabla u_k - \nabla u_0|^n \to 0 \text{ as } k \to \infty.$$

Since $m(t) \geq m_0$, we obtain $u_k \to u$ strongly in $W_0^{1,n}(\Omega)$ and hence $\|u_k\| \to \|u_0\|$. Therefore, $J(u_0) = c_*$ and hence the claim.

Now By Assertion 3 and (2.23) we can see that $M(\rho_0^n) = M(\|u_0\|^n)$ which shows that $\rho_0^n = \|u_0\|^n$. Hence by (2.22) we have

$$m(\|u_0\|^n) \int_\Omega |\nabla u_0|^{n-2}\nabla u_0 \nabla v \; dx = \int_\Omega f(x,u_0)v \; dx, \text{ for all } v \in W_0^{1,n}(\Omega).$$

Thus, u_0 is a solution of $(\mathcal{M})$. □

3 Convex-Concave type nonlinearities

In this section, we study the existence and multiplicity of solutions for the following problem

$$(P_{\lambda,M}) \quad \begin{cases} -m(\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^n)\Delta_n u = \lambda h(x)|u|^{q-1}u + u|u|^p\ e^{|u|^\beta} \text{ in } \Omega \\ u \geq 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \quad u \in W_0^{1,n}(\Omega), \\ u = 0 \qquad \text{on} \quad \partial\Omega \end{cases}$$

where $0 < q < n-1 < 2n-1 < p+1$, $\beta \in (1, \frac{n}{n-1}]$ and $\lambda > 0$. Let $\gamma = \frac{n}{n-q-1}$, $k = \frac{p+2+\beta}{q+1} > 1$ and $k' = \frac{k}{k-1}$. We assume the following:

$(A1)$ $m(s) = as + b$, where a, $b > 0$.

$(A2)$ $h \in L^\gamma(\Omega)$, $h^+ \not\equiv 0$, h can be indefinite and vanish in some open subset of Ω.

We show the following existence and multiplicity result in the subcritical case:

Theorem 3.1 *Let $\beta \in \left(1, \frac{n}{n-1}\right)$. Then there exists $\lambda_0 > 0$ such that for $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0)$, $(P_{\lambda,M})$ admits at least two solutions.*

In the critical case, we show the following existence result:

Theorem 3.2 *Let $\beta = \frac{n}{n-1}$, then there exist $\lambda_{00} > 0$ such that for $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_{00})$, $(P_{\lambda,M})$ admits a solution.*

3.1 The Nehari manifold and fibering maps

The Euler functional associated with the problem $(P_{\lambda,M})$ is $J_{\lambda,M} : W_0^{1,n}(\Omega) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined as

$$J_{\lambda,M}(u) = \frac{1}{n}M(\|u\|^n) - \frac{\lambda}{q+1}\int_\Omega h(x)|u|^{q+1}dx - \int_\Omega G(u)dx, \tag{3.1}$$

where $g(u) = u|u|^p e^{|u|^\beta}$, $G(u) = \int_0^u g(s)ds$ and $M(u) = \int_0^u m(s)ds$, .

Definition 3.3 *We say that $u \in W_0^{1,n}(\Omega)$ is a weak solution of $(P_{\lambda,M})$ if for all $\phi \in W_0^{1,n}(\Omega)$, we have*

$$m(\|u\|^n)\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^{n-2}\nabla u \nabla \phi dx = \int_\Omega g(u)\phi dx + \lambda\int_\Omega h(x)|u|^{q-1}u\phi dx. \tag{3.2}$$

For $u \in W_0^{1,n}(\Omega)$, we define the fiber map $\phi_{u,M} : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}$ as

$$\phi_{u,M}(t) = J_{\lambda,M}(tu) = \frac{t^n}{n}M(\|u\|^n) - \frac{\lambda t^{q+1}}{q+1}\int_\Omega h(x)|u|^{q+1}dx - \int_\Omega G(tu)dx.$$

Also

$$\phi'_{u,M}(t) = t^{n-1}m(\|u\|^n) - \lambda t^q \int_\Omega h(x)|u|^{q+1}dx - \int_\Omega g(tu)udx,$$
$$\phi''_{u,M}(t) = (n-1)t^{n-2}m(\|tu\|^n)\|u\|^n + nt^{2n-2}m'(\|tu\|^n)\|u\|^{2n} - q\lambda t^{q-1}\int_\Omega h(x)|u|^{q+1}dx - \int_\Omega g'(tu)u^2.$$

It is easy to see that the energy functional $J_{\lambda,M}$ is not bounded below on the space $W_0^{1,n}(\Omega)$. But we will show that it is bounded below on an appropriate subset of $W_0^{1,n}(\Omega)$ and a minimizer on subsets of this set gives rise to solutions of $(P_{\lambda,M})$. In order to obtain the existence results, we define the Nehari manifold

$$\mathcal{N}_{\lambda,M} := \left\{u \in W_0^{1,n}(\Omega) : \langle J'_{\lambda,M}(u), u\rangle = 0\right\} = \left\{u \in W_0^{1,n}(\Omega) : \phi'_{u,M}(1) = 0\right\}$$

where $\langle\ ,\ \rangle$ denotes the duality between $W_0^{1,n}(\Omega)$ and its dual space. Therefore $u \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda,M}$ if and only if

$$m(\|u\|^n) - \lambda\int_\Omega h(x)|u|^{q+1}dx - \int_\Omega g(u)udx = 0. \tag{3.3}$$

We note that $\mathcal{N}_{\lambda,M}$ contains every solution of $(P_{\lambda,M})$. One can easily see that $tu \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda,M}$ if and only if $\phi'_{u,M}(t) = 0$ and in particular, $u \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda,M}$ if and only if $\phi'_{u,M}(1) = 0$. Also

$$\mathcal{N}^{\pm}_{\lambda,M} := \left\{u \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda,M} : \phi''_{u,M}(1) \gtrless 0\right\} = \left\{tu \in W_0^{1,n}(\Omega) : \phi'_{u,M}(t) = 0,\ \phi''_{u,M}(t) \gtrless 0\right\},$$
$$\mathcal{N}^{0}_{\lambda,M} := \left\{u \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda,M} : \phi''_{u,M}(1) = 0\right\} = \left\{tu \in W_0^{1,n}(\Omega) : \phi'_{u,M}(t) = 0,\ \phi''_{u,M}(t) = 0\right\}.$$

Let $H(u) = \int_\Omega h|u|^{q+1}dx$. Then we define $H^{\pm} := \{u \in W_0^{1,n}(\Omega) : H(u) \gtrless 0\}$, $H_0 := \{u \in W_0^{1,n}(\Omega) : H(u) = 0\}$, and $H_0^{\pm} := H^{\pm} \cup H_0$.

Now we describe the behavior of the fibering map $\phi_{u,M}$ according to the sign of $H(u)$.
Case 1: $u \in H_0^-$.
In this case, firstly we define $\psi_u : \mathbb{R}^+ \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\psi_u(t) = t^{n-1-q}m(\|tu\|^n) - t^{-q}\int_\Omega g(tu)udx. \tag{3.4}$$

Clearly, for $t > 0$, $tu \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda,M}$ if and only if t is a solution of $\psi_u(t) = \lambda\int_\Omega h(x)|u|^{q+1}$.

$$\psi'_u(t) = (n-1-q)t^{(n-2-q)}m(\|tu\|^n)\|u\|^n + nt^{2n-2-q}m'(\|tu\|^n)\|u\|^{2n} - t^{-q}\int_\Omega g'(tu)u^2 \tag{3.5}$$

$$=(2n-1-q)t^{2n-2-q}a\|u\|^{2n} + (n-1-q)bt^{n-2-q}\|u\|^n - (1+p-q)t^{-1-q}\int_\Omega g(tu)u - \beta t^{-q-1+\beta}\int_\Omega |u|^\beta g(tu)u. \tag{3.6}$$

Therefore $\psi_u'(t) < 0$ for all $t > 0$. As $u \in H_0^-$ so there exists $t_*(u)$ such that $\psi_u(t_*) = \lambda \int_\Omega h(x)|u|^{q+1}$. Thus for $0 < t < t_*$, $\phi_{u,M}^{'}(t) = t^q(\psi_u(t) - \lambda \int_\Omega h(x)|u|^{q+1}) > 0$ and for $t > t_*$, $\phi_{u,M}^{'}(t) < 0$. Hence $\phi_{u,M}$ is increasing on $(0, t_*)$, decreasing on (t_*, ∞). Since $\phi_{u,M}(t) > 0$ for t close to 0 and $\phi_{u,M}(t) \to -\infty$ as $t \to \infty$, we get $\phi_{u,M}$ has exactly one critical point $t_1(u)$, which is a global maximum point. Hence $t_1(u)u \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda,M}^-$.
Case 2: $u \in H^+$.
In this case, we claim that there exists $\lambda_0 > 0$ and a unique t_* such that for $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0)$, ϕ_u has exactly two critical points $t_1(u)$ and $t_2(u)$ such that $t_1(u) < t_*(u) < t_2(u)$, and moreover $t_1(u)$ is a local minimum point and $t_2(u)$ is a local maximum point. Thus $t_1(u)u \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda,M}^+$ and $t_2(u)u \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda,M}^-$.
To show this we need following Lemmas:

Lemma 3.4 *Let* $\Lambda := \left\{ u \in W_0^{1,n}(\Omega) \mid \|u\|^{\frac{3n}{2}} \leq \dfrac{\int_\Omega g'(u)u^2 dx}{2\sqrt{ab(2n-1-q)(n-1-q)}} \right\}$. *Then there exists* $\lambda_0 > 0$ *such that for every* $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0)$,

$$\Lambda_m := \inf_{u \in \Lambda \setminus \{0\} \cap H_0^+} \left\{ \int_\Omega \left(p + 2 - 2n + \beta|u|^\beta \right) |u|^{p+2} e^{|u|^\beta} - (2n-1-q)\lambda \int_\Omega h(x)|u|^{q+1} \right\} > 0. \tag{3.7}$$

Proof. Step 1: $\inf\limits_{u \in \Lambda \setminus \{0\} \cap H_0^+} \|u\| > 0$. Suppose this is not true. Then we find a sequence $\{u_k\} \subset \Lambda \setminus \{0\} \cap H_0^+$ such that $\|u_k\| \to 0$ and we have

$$\|u_k\|^{\frac{3n}{2}} \leq \left(\frac{1}{2\sqrt{ab(2n-1-q)(n-1-q)}} \right) \int_\Omega g'(u_k)u_k^2 \, dx \quad \forall \ k. \tag{3.8}$$

From $g(u) = u|u|^p e^{|u|^\beta}$, Hölder's inequality and Sobolev inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_\Omega g'(u_k)u_k^2 dx &= \int_\Omega \left(p + 1 + \beta|u_k|^\beta \right) |u_k|^{p+2} e^{|u_k|^\beta} dx \\
&\leq C \int_\Omega |u_k|^{p+2} e^{(1+\delta)|u_k|^\beta} dx \\
&\leq C \left(\int_\Omega |u_k|^{(p+2)t'} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{t'}} \left(\int_\Omega e^{t(1+\delta)|u_k|^\beta} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{t}} \\
&\leq C' \|u_k\|^{p+2} \left(\sup_{\|w_k\| \leq 1} \int_\Omega e^{t(1+\delta)\|u_k\|^\beta |w_k|^\beta} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{t}},
\end{aligned}$$

since $\|u_k\| \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$, we can choose $\alpha = t(1+\delta)\|u_k\|^\beta$ such that $\alpha \leq \alpha_n$. Hence by this, (3.8), we obtain $1 \leq K'\|u_k\|^{p+2-\frac{3n}{2}} \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$, since $p + 2 > \frac{3n}{2}$, which gives a contradiction.
Step 2: Let $C_1 = \inf\limits_{u \in \Lambda \setminus \{0\} \cap H_0^+} \int_\Omega \left(p + 2 - 2n + \beta|u|^\beta \right) |u|^{p+2} e^{|u|^\beta} dx$. Then $C_1 > 0$.

From Step 1 and the definition of Λ, we obtain

$$0 < \inf_{u\in\Lambda\setminus\{0\}\cap H_0^+} \int_\Omega g'(u)u^2dx = \inf_{u\in\Lambda\setminus\{0\}\cap H_0^+} \int_\Omega \left(p+1+\beta|u|^\beta\right)|u|^{p+2}e^{|u|^\beta}dx.$$

Using this it is easy to check that

$$\inf_{u\in\Lambda\setminus\{0\}\cap H_0^+} \int_\Omega \left(p+2-2n+\beta|u|^\beta\right)|u|^{p+2}e^{|u|^\beta}dx > 0.$$

This completes step 2.
Step 3: Let $\lambda < \frac{1}{(2n-q-1)}(\frac{C_1}{l})^{\frac{(k-1)}{k}}$, where $l = \int_\Omega |h(x)|^{\frac{k}{k-1}}dx$. Then (3.7) holds.
Using Hölder's inequality and $(A2)$ we have,

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_\Omega h(x)|u|^{q+1} &\le \left(\int_\Omega |h(x)|^{\frac{k}{k-1}}dx\right)^{\frac{k-1}{k}} \left(\int_\Omega |u|^{(q+1)k}dx\right)^{\frac{1}{k}} \\
&= l^{\frac{k-1}{k}} \left(\int_\Omega |u|^{p+2+\beta}dx\right)^{\frac{1}{k}} \\
&\le l^{\frac{k-1}{k}} \left(\int_\Omega \left(p+2-2n+\beta|u|^\beta\right)|u|^{p+2}e^{|u|^\beta}dx\right)^{\frac{1}{k}} \\
&\le \left(\frac{l}{C_1}\right)^{\frac{k-1}{k}} \int_\Omega \left(p+2-2n+\beta|u|^\beta\right)|u|^{p+2}e^{|u|^\beta}dx.
\end{aligned}$$

The above inequality combined with step 2 proves the Lemma. □

The following Lemma completes the proof of claim made in case 2 above:

Lemma 3.5 *Let λ be such that (3.7) holds. Then for every $u \in H^+ \setminus \{0\}$, there is a unique $t_* = t_*(u) > 0$ and unique $t_1 = t_1(u) < t_* < t_2 = t_2(u)$ such that $t_1u \in \mathcal{N}^+_{\lambda,M}$, $t_2u \in \mathcal{N}^-_{\lambda,M}$ and $J_{\lambda,M}(t_1u) = \min\limits_{0\le t\le t_2} J_{\lambda,M}(tu)$, $J_{\lambda,M}(t_2u) = \max\limits_{t\ge t_*} J_{\lambda,M}(tu)$.*

Proof. Fix $0 \ne u \in H^+$. Then from (3.4), we note that $\psi_u(t) \to -\infty$ as $t \to \infty$, from (3.5) it is easy to see that $\lim\limits_{t\to 0^+} \psi'_u(t) > 0$ and sum of second and third term in (3.5) is a monotone function in t. So there exists a unique $t_* = t_*(u) > 0$ such that $\psi_u(t)$ is increasing on $(0, t_*)$, decreasing on (t_*, ∞) and $\psi'_u(t_*) = 0$. Using this and (3.5), we get $t_*u \in \Lambda \setminus \{0\} \cap H^+$. From $t_*^{q+2}\psi'_u(t_*) = 0$ and by definition of ψ_u, we get

$$\psi_u(t_*) = \frac{1}{t_*^{q+1}(2n-1-q)} \left[\int_\Omega g'(t_*u)(t_*u)^2dx - (2n-1)\int_\Omega g(t_*u)t_*udx\right].$$

Using Lemma 3.4 and noting that $g'(s)s^2-(2n-1)g(s)s=(p+2-2n+\beta|s|^\beta)|s|^{p+2}e^{|s|^\beta}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_u(t_*)-\lambda\int_\Omega h(x)|u|^{q+1}&=\frac{1}{t_*^{q+1}(2n-1-q)}\left[\int_\Omega\left(g'(t_*u)(t_*u)^2-(2n-1)g(t_*u)t_*u\right)dx\right.\\&\qquad\left.-(2n-1-q)\lambda\int_\Omega h|t_*u|^{q+1}\right]\\&>\frac{\Lambda_m}{t_*^{q+1}(2n-1-q)}>0.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\psi_u(0)=0$, ψ_u is increasing in $(0,t_*)$ and strictly decreasing in (t_*,∞), $\lim\limits_{t\to\infty}\psi_u(t)=-\infty$ and $u\in H^+$. Then there exists a unique $t_1=t_1(u)<t_*$ and $t_2=t_2(u)>t_*$ such that $\psi_u(t_1)=\lambda\int_\Omega h(x)|u|^{q+1}=\psi_u(t_2)$ implies $t_1u,\ t_2u\in\mathcal{N}_{\lambda,M}$. Also $\psi_u'(t_1)>0$ and $\psi_u'(t_2)<0$ give $t_1u\in\mathcal{N}^+_{\lambda,M}$ and $t_2u\in\mathcal{N}^-_{\lambda,M}$. Since $\phi'_{u,M}(t)=t^q(\psi_u(t)-\lambda\int_\Omega h(x)|u|^{q+1})$. Then $\phi'_{u,M}(t)<0$ for all $t\in[0,t_1)$ and $\phi'_{u,M}(t)>0$ for all $t\in(t_1,t_2)$ so $\phi_{u,M}(t_1)=\min\limits_{0\le t\le t_2}\phi_{u,M}(t)$. Also $\phi'_{u,M}(t)>0$ for all $t\in[t_*,t_2)$, $\phi'_{u,M}(t_2)=0$ and $\phi'_{u,M}(t)<0$ for all $t\in(t_2,\infty)$ implies that $\phi_{u,M}(t_2)=\max\limits_{t\ge t_*}\phi_{u,M}(t)$. □

Lemma 3.6 *If λ be such that (3.7) holds. Then $\mathcal{N}^0_{\lambda,M}=\{0\}$.*

Proof. Suppose $u\in\mathcal{N}^0_{\lambda,M}$, $u\not\equiv 0$. Then by definition of $\mathcal{N}^0_{\lambda,M}$, we have the following two equations

$$(2n-1)a\|u\|^{2n}+(n-1)b\|u\|^n=\int_\Omega g'(u)u^2dx+\lambda q\int_\Omega h(x)|u|^{q+1},\tag{3.9}$$

$$a\|u\|^{2n}+b\|u\|^n=\int_\Omega g(u)udx+\lambda\int_\Omega h(x)|u|^{q+1}.\tag{3.10}$$

Let $u\in H^+\cap\mathcal{N}^0_{\lambda,M}$ and $\lambda\in(0,\lambda_0)$. Then from above equations, we can easily deduce that

$$(2n-1-q)a\|u\|^{2n}+(n-1-q)b\|u\|^n\le\int_\Omega g'(u)u^2dx.$$

Then using the inequality $\sqrt{ab}\le\frac{a+b}{2}$ for $a,b\ge0$, we obtain

$$2\sqrt{(2n-1-q)ab}\|u\|^{\frac{3n}{2}}\le(2n-1-q)a\|u\|^{2n}+(n-1-q)b\|u\|^n.$$

Hence $u\in\Lambda\setminus\{0\}$. Noting that $g'(s)s^2-(2n-1)g(s)s=(p+2-2n+\beta|s|^\beta)|s|^{p+2}e^{|s|^\beta}$, from (3.9) and (3.10), we get

$$\begin{aligned}(2n-1-q)\lambda\int_\Omega h(x)|u|^{q+1}&=\int_\Omega\left(p+2-2n+\beta|u|^\beta\right)|u|^{p+2}e^{|u|^\beta}dx+nb\|u\|^n\\&>\int_\Omega\left(p+2-2n+\beta|u|^\beta\right)|u|^{p+2}e^{|u|^\beta}dx,\end{aligned}$$

which violates Lemma 3.4. Hence $\mathcal{N}^0_{\lambda,M}=\{0\}$. In other cases, $u\in H_0^-\cap\mathcal{N}^0_{\lambda,M}$, we see that $t=1$ is a critical point of $\phi_{u,M}(t)$ and $\phi''_{u,M}(1)=0$. But $u\in H_0^-$ implies that $\phi_{u,M}$ has exactly one critical point corresponding to global maxima i.e $\phi''_{u,M}(1)\neq0$ which is a contradiction. Hence $\mathcal{N}^0_{\lambda,M}=\{0\}$. □

3.2 Existence and multiplicity of solutions

In this section we show that $J_{\lambda,M}$ is bounded below on $\mathcal{N}_{\lambda,M}$. Also we show that $J_{\lambda,M}$ attains its minimizer on $H^+ \cap \mathcal{N}^+_{\lambda,M}$.
We define $\theta_{\lambda,M} := \inf\{J_{\lambda,M}(u) \mid u \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda,M}\}$ and prove the following lower bound:

Theorem 3.7 *$J_{\lambda,M}$ is bounded below and coercive on $\mathcal{N}_{\lambda,M}$. Moreover, there exists a constant $C = C(p,q,n) > 0$ such that $\theta_{\lambda,M} \geq -C\lambda^{\frac{k}{k-1}}$.*

Proof. Let $u \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda,M}$. Then we have

$$J_{\lambda,M}(u) = \frac{(p+2-2n)}{2n(p+2)}a\|u\|^{2n} + \frac{(p+2-n)}{n(p+2)}b\|u\|^n + \int_\Omega \left(\frac{1}{p+2}g(u)u - G(u)\right) - \frac{\lambda(p+1-q)}{(q+1)(p+2)}\int_\Omega h|u|^{q+1}. \tag{3.11}$$

Using $G(s) \leq \frac{1}{p+2}g(s)s$ for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$, Hölder's and Sobolev inequalities in (3.11), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} J_{\lambda,M}(u) &\geq \frac{(p+2-2n)}{2n(p+2)}a\|u\|^{2n} + \frac{(p+2-n)}{n(p+2)}b\|u\|^n - \frac{\lambda(p+1-q)}{(q+1)(p+2)}\int_\Omega h(x)|u|^{q+1}dx \\ &\geq \frac{(p+2-2n)}{2n(p+2)}a\|u\|^{2n} + \frac{(p+2-n)}{n(p+2)}b\|u\|^n - \frac{\lambda(p+1-q)}{(q+1)(p+2)}C_0\|u\|^{q+1}, \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $C_0 > 0$, which shows $J_{\lambda,M}$ is coercive on $\mathcal{N}_{\lambda,M}$ as $q+1 < 2n$.
Again for $u \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda,M}$, we have

$$J_{\lambda,M}(u) = \frac{1}{2n}\int_\Omega g(u)u - \int_\Omega G(u) - \lambda\left(\frac{1}{q+1} - \frac{1}{2n}\right)\int_\Omega h(x)|u|^{q+1} + \frac{b}{2n}\|u\|^n. \tag{3.12}$$

Also, It is easy to see that

$$\frac{1}{2n}g(u)u - G(u) \geq \left(\frac{1}{2n} - \frac{1}{p+2}\right)|u|^{p+2+\beta}, \tag{3.13}$$

If $u \in H_0^-$, then $J_\lambda(u)$ is bounded below by 0. If $u \in H^+$ then by using Hölder's inequality, we have

$$\int_\Omega h(x)|u|^{q+1} \leq l^{\frac{k-1}{k}}\left(\int_\Omega |u|^{(q+1)k}dx\right)^{\frac{1}{k}},$$

where $l = \int_\Omega |h(x)|^{k/k-1}dx$. From above inequalities, we get

$$J_{\lambda,M}(u) \geq \left(\frac{1}{2n} - \frac{1}{p+2}\right)\int_\Omega |u|^{(q+1)k}dx - \frac{\lambda(2n-q-1)l^{\frac{k-1}{k}}}{2n(q+1)}\left(\int_\Omega |u|^{(q+1)k}dx\right)^{\frac{1}{k}},$$

where $k = \frac{p+2+\beta}{q+1}$. By considering the global minimum of the function $\rho(x) : \mathbb{R}^+ \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defines as
$\rho(x) = \left(\frac{1}{2n} - \frac{1}{p+2}\right)x^k - \left(\frac{\lambda(2n-q-1)l^{\frac{k-1}{k}}}{2n(q+1)}\right)x$, it can be shown that

$$\inf_{u\in\mathcal{N}_{\lambda,M}} J_{\lambda,M}(u) \geq \rho\left[\left(\frac{\lambda(2n-q-1)(p+2)l^{\frac{k-1}{k}}}{k(q+1)(p+2-2n)}\right)^{\frac{1}{k-1}}\right].$$

From this it follows that

$$\theta_{\lambda,M} \geq -C(p,q,n)\lambda^{\frac{k}{k-1}}, \tag{3.14}$$

where $C(p,q,n) = \left(\frac{1}{k^{\frac{1}{k-1}}} - \frac{1}{k^{\frac{k}{k-1}}}\right) \frac{l(p+2)^{\frac{1}{k-1}}(2n-q-1)^{\frac{k}{k-1}}}{2n(p+2-2n)^{\frac{1}{k-1}}(q+1)^{\frac{k}{k-1}}} > 0$. Hence $J_{\lambda,M}$ is bounded below on $\mathcal{N}_{\lambda,M}$. □

The following lemma shows that minimizers for $J_{\lambda,M}$ on any subset of $\mathcal{N}_{\lambda,M}$ are usually critical points for $J_{\lambda,M}$.

Lemma 3.8 *Let u be a local minimizer for $J_{\lambda,M}$ in any of the subsets of $\mathcal{N}_{\lambda,M}$ such that $u \notin \mathcal{N}^0_{\lambda,M}$, then u is a critical point for $J_{\lambda,M}$.*

Proof. Let u be a local minimizer for $J_{\lambda,M}$ in any of the subsets of $\mathcal{N}_{\lambda,M}$. Then, in any case u is a minimizer for $J_{\lambda,M}$ under the constraint $I_{\lambda,M}(u) := \langle J'_{\lambda,M}(u), u\rangle = 0$. Hence, by the theory of Lagrange multipliers, there exists $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $J'_{\lambda,M}(u) = \mu I'_{\lambda,M}(u)$. Thus $\langle J'_{\lambda,M}(u), u\rangle = \mu \langle I'_{\lambda,M}(u), u\rangle = \mu\phi''_{u,M}(1)=0$, but $u \notin \mathcal{N}^0_{\lambda,M}$ and so $\phi''_{u,M}(1) \neq 0$. Hence $\mu = 0$ completes the proof. □

Lemma 3.9 *Let λ satisfy (3.7). Then given $u \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda,M} \setminus \{0\}$, there exist $\epsilon > 0$ and a differentiable function $\xi : \boldsymbol{B}(0,\epsilon) \subset W_0^{1,n}(\Omega) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\xi(0) = 1$, the function $\xi(w)(u - w) \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda,M}$ and for all $w \in W_0^{1,n}(\Omega)$*

$$\langle \xi'(0), w\rangle = \frac{n(a\|u\|^n + a + b)\int_\Omega(|\nabla u|^{n-2}\nabla u\nabla w - \int_\Omega (g(u) + g'(u)u)\, w - \lambda(q+1)\int_\Omega h(x)|u|^{q-1}uw}{(2n-1-q)a\|u\|^{2n} + (n-q-1)b\|u\|^n - \int_\Omega g'(u)u^2dx + q\int_\Omega g(u)udx}. \tag{3.15}$$

Proof. Fix $u \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda,M} \setminus \{0\}$, define a function $G_u : \mathbb{R} \times W_0^{1,n}(\Omega) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as follows:

$$G_u(t,v) = at^{2n-1-q}\|u-w\|^{2n} + bt^{n-1-q}\|u-v\|^n - t^{-q}\int_\Omega g(t(u-v))(u-v)dx - \lambda\int_\Omega h|u-v|^{q+1}.$$

Then $G_u \in C^1(\mathbb{R} \times W_0^{1,n}(\Omega); \mathbb{R})$, $G_u(1,0) = \langle J'_{\lambda,M}(u), u\rangle = 0$ and

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}G_u(1,0) = (2n-1-q)a\|u\|^{2n} + (n-1-q)b\|u\|^n - \int_\Omega g'(u)u^2dx + q\int_\Omega g(u)udx \neq 0,$$

since $\mathcal{N}^0_{\lambda,M} = \{0\}$. By the Implicit function theorem, there exist $\epsilon > 0$ and a differentiable function $\xi : \mathbf{B}(0,\epsilon) \subset W_0^{1,n}(\Omega) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\xi(0) = 1$, and $G_u(\xi(w), w) = 0$ for all $w \in \mathbf{B}(0,\epsilon)$ which is equivalent to $\langle J'_{\lambda,M}(\xi(w)(u-w)), \xi(w)(u-w)\rangle = 0$ for all $w \in \mathbf{B}(0,\epsilon)$ and hence $\xi(w)(u-w) \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda,M}$. Now differentiating $G_u(\xi(w), w) = 0$ with respect to w we obtain (3.15). □

Lemma 3.10 *Let λ satisfy (3.7). Then given $u \in \mathcal{N}^-_{\lambda,M} \setminus \{0\}$, there exist $\epsilon > 0$ and a differentiable function $\xi^- : \boldsymbol{B}(0,\epsilon) \subset W^{1,n}_0(\Omega) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\xi^-(0) = 1$, the function $\xi^-(w)(u-w) \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda,M}$ and for all $w \in W^{1,n}_0(\Omega)$*

$$\langle (\xi^-)'(0), w\rangle = \frac{n(a\|u\|^n + a + b)\int_\Omega (|\nabla u|^{n-2}\nabla u\nabla w - \int_\Omega \big(g(u) + g'(u)u\big)w - \lambda(q+1)\int_\Omega h(x)|u|^{q-1}uw}{(2n-1-q)a\|u\|^{2n} + (n-q-1)b\|u\|^n - \int_\Omega g'(u)u^2dx + q\int_\Omega g(u)udx}.$$

Proof. First, we note that if $u \in \mathcal{N}^-_{\lambda,M}$, then $u \in \Lambda \setminus \{0\}$, satisfies (3.7). Then Lemma 3.9, there exist $\epsilon > 0$ and a differentiable function $\xi^- : \mathbf{B}(0,\epsilon) \subset W^{1,n}_0(\Omega) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\xi^-(0) = 1$ and the function $\xi^-(w)(u-w) \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda,M}$ for all $w \in \mathbf{B}(0,\epsilon)$. Since $u \in \mathcal{N}^-_{\lambda,M}$, we have

$$(2n-1-q)a\|u\|^{2n} + (n-1-q)b\|u\|^n + q\int_\Omega g(u)udx - \int_\Omega g'(u)u^2dx < 0.$$

Thus by continuity of $J'_{\lambda,M}$ and ξ^-, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\phi''_{(\xi^-(w)(u-w),M)}(1) &= (2n-1-q)a\|\xi^-(w)(u-w)\|^{2n} + (n-1-q)b\|\xi^-(w)(u-w)\|^n \\ &+ q\int_\Omega g(\xi^-(w)(u-w))\xi^-(w)(u-w) - \int_\Omega g'(\xi^-(w)(u-w))(\xi^-(w)(u-w))^2 < 0,\end{aligned}$$

if ϵ is sufficiently small. This concludes the proof.

Lemma 3.11 *There exists a constant $C_2 > 0$ such that $\theta_{\lambda,M} \le -\frac{(p+1-q)}{n(q+1)(p+2)}C_2$.*

Proof. Let v be such that $\int_\Omega h|v|^{q+1} > 0$. Then by the fibering map analysis, we can find $t_1 = t_1(v) > 0$ such that $t_1 v \in \mathcal{N}^+_{\lambda,M}$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}J_{\lambda,M}(t_1v) &= \left(\frac{1}{2n} - \frac{1}{q+1}\right)a\|t_1v\|^{2n} + \left(\frac{1}{n} - \frac{1}{q+1}\right)b\|t_1v\|^n - \int_\Omega G(t_1v) + \frac{1}{q+1}\int_\Omega g(t_1v)t_1v \\ &\le \frac{2n+q}{2n(q+1)}\int_\Omega g(t_1v)t_1vdx - \int_\Omega G(t_1v)dx - \frac{1}{2n(q+1)}\int_\Omega g'(t_1v)(t_1v)^2dx, \qquad (3.16)\end{aligned}$$

since $t_1v \in \mathcal{N}^+_{\lambda,M}$. We now consider the function

$$\rho(s) = \frac{2n+q}{2n(q+1)}g(s)s - G(s) - \frac{1}{2n(q+1)}g'(s)s^2.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}\rho'(s) &= \frac{(q+2n-2)}{2n(q+1)}g'(s)s - \frac{q(2n-1)}{2n(q+1)}g(s) - \frac{1}{2n(q+1)}g''(s)s^2 \\ &= \left(\frac{(q+2n-2-p)(p+1) - (n-1)q}{2n(q+1)}\right)g(s) \\ &\quad + \beta\left(\frac{q-p+2n-2-\beta-p-1}{2n(q+1)}\right)g(s)|s|^\beta - \frac{\beta^2}{2n(q+1)}g(s)|s|^{2\beta}.\end{aligned}$$

Now it is not difficult to see that coefficients in the first and second term are negative, since $p > 2n-2$. As $\rho(0) = 0$, it follows that $\rho(s) \leq 0$ for all $s \in \mathbb{R}^+$. Also it can be easily verified that

$$\lim_{s\to 0} \frac{\rho(s)}{|s|^{p+2}} = -\frac{(p+1-q)(p+2-2n)}{2n(q+1)(p+2)}, \quad \lim_{s\to\infty} \frac{\rho(s)}{|s|^{p+2+\beta}e^{|s|^\beta}} = -\frac{\beta}{2n(q+1)}.$$

From these two estimates, we get that

$$\rho(s) \leq -\frac{(p+1-q)}{2n(q+1)(p+2)} \left(p+2-2n+\beta|s|^\beta\right) |s|^{p+2} e^{|s|^\beta}. \tag{3.17}$$

Therefore, using (3.16) and (3.17), we get

$$\begin{aligned} J_{\lambda,M}(t_1 v) &\leq -\frac{(p+1-q)}{2n(q+1)(p+2)} \int_\Omega \left(p+2-2n+\beta|t_1 v|^\beta\right) |t_1 v|^{p+2}\ e^{|t_1 v|^\beta} dx \\ &\leq -\frac{(p+1-q)}{2n(q+1)(p+2)} \int_\Omega |t_1 v|^{p+2+\beta} dx \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\theta_{\lambda,M} \leq \inf_{u\in\mathcal{N}^+_{\lambda,M}\cap H^+} J_{\lambda,M}(u) \leq -\frac{(p+1-q)}{2n(q+1)(p+2)}\, C_2$, where $C_2 = \int_\Omega |t_1 v|^{p+2+\beta} dx$. □

By Lemma 3.7, $J_{\lambda,M}$ is bounded below on $\mathcal{N}_{\lambda,M}$. So, by Ekeland's Variational principle, we can find a sequence $\{u_k\} \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda,M} \setminus \{0\}$ such that

$$J_{\lambda,M}(u_k) \leq \theta_{\lambda,M} + \frac{1}{k}, \tag{3.18}$$

$$J_{\lambda,M}(v) \geq J_{\lambda,M}(u_k) - \frac{1}{k}\|v-u_k\| \ \text{ for all } \ v \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda,M}. \tag{3.19}$$

Now from (3.18) and Lemma 3.11, we have

$$J_{\lambda,M}(u_k) \leq -\frac{(p+1-q)}{2n(q+1)(p+2)}\, C_3. \tag{3.20}$$

Also as $u_k \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda,M}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} J_{\lambda,M}(u_k) = &\left(\frac{1}{2n}-\frac{1}{p+2}\right) a\|u_k\|^{2n} + \left(\frac{1}{n}-\frac{1}{p+2}\right) b\|u_k\|^n - \frac{\lambda(p+1-q)}{(q+1)(p+2)} \int_\Omega h|u_k|^{q+1} \\ &+ \int_\Omega \left(\frac{1}{p+2} g(u_k)u_k - G(u_k)\right) dx. \end{aligned}$$

This together with (3.20) and $\frac{1}{p+2}g(u_k)u_k - G(u_k) \geq 0$, we obtain

$$H(u_k) \geq \frac{C_3}{2n\lambda} > 0 \text{ for all } k. \tag{3.21}$$

Thus we have $u_k \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda,M} \cap H^+$. Now we prove the following:

Proposition 3.12 *Let λ satisfies (3.7). Then $\|J'_{\lambda,M}(u_k)\|_* \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$.*

Proof. Step 1: $\liminf_{k\to\infty}\|u_k\|>0$.
Applying Hölder's inequality in (3.21), we have $K'\|u_k\|^{q+1}\geq\int_\Omega h|u_k|^{q+1}\geq\frac{C_3}{2n\lambda}>0$ which implies that $\liminf\limits_{k\to\infty}\|u_k\|>0$.
Step 2: We claim that

$$K:=\liminf_{k\to\infty}\left\{(2n-1-q)a\|u_k\|^{2n}+(n-1-q)b\|u_k\|^n-\int_\Omega g'(u_k)u_k^2dx+q\int_\Omega g(u_k)u_kdx\right\}>0. \tag{3.22}$$

Assume by contradiction that for some subsequence of $\{u_k\}$, still denoted by $\{u_k\}$ we have

$$(2n-1-q)a\|u_k\|^{2n}+(n-1-q)b\|u_k\|^n-\int_\Omega g'(u_k)u_k^2dx+q\int_\Omega g(u_k)u_kdx=o_k(1),$$

where $o_k(1)\to 0$ as $k\to\infty$. From this and the fact that $\{u_k\}$ is bounded away from 0, we obtain that $\liminf\limits_{k\to\infty}\int_\Omega g'(u_k)u_k^2dx>0$. Hence, we get $u_k\in\Lambda\setminus\{0\}$ for all k large. Using this and the fact that $u_k\in\mathcal{N}_{\lambda,M}\setminus\{0\}$, we have

$$o_k(1)=(2n-q-1)\lambda\int_\Omega h|u_k|^{q+1}-nb\|u_k\|^n-\int_\Omega(g'(u_k)u_k^2-(2n-1)g(u_k)u_k)dx<-\Lambda_m$$

by (3.7), which is a contradiction.
Finally, we show that $\|J'_{\lambda,M}(u_k)\|_*\to 0$ as $k\to\infty$. By Lemma 3.9, we obtain a sequence of functions $\xi_k:\mathbf{B}(0,\epsilon_k)\to\mathbb{R}$ for some $\epsilon_k>0$ such that $\xi_k(0)=1$ and $\xi_k(w)(u_k-w)\in\mathcal{N}_{\lambda,M}$ for all $w\in\mathbf{B}(0,\epsilon_k)$. Choose $0<\rho<\epsilon_k$ and $f\in W_0^{1,n}(\Omega)$ such that $\|f\|=1$. Let $w_\rho=\rho f$. Then $\|w_\rho\|=\rho<\epsilon_k$ and $\eta_\rho=\xi_k(w_\rho)(u_k-w_\rho)\in\mathcal{N}_{\lambda,M}$ for all k. Since $\eta_\rho\in\mathcal{N}_{\lambda,M}$, we deduce from (3.19) and Taylor's expansion,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{n}\|\eta_\rho-u_k\|&\geq J_{\lambda,M}(u_k)-J_{\lambda,M}(\eta_\rho)=\langle J'_{\lambda,M}(\eta_\rho),u_k-\eta_\rho\rangle+o(\|u_k-\eta_\rho\|)\\&=(1-\xi_k(w_\rho))\langle J'_{\lambda,M}(\eta_\rho),u_k\rangle+\rho\xi_k(w_\rho)\langle J'_{\lambda,M}(\eta_\rho),f\rangle+o(\|u_k-\eta_\rho\|).\end{aligned} \tag{3.23}$$

We note that as $\rho\to 0$, $\frac{1}{\rho}\|\eta_\rho-u_k\|=\|u_k\langle\xi_k'(0),f\rangle-f\|$. Now dividing (3.23) by ρ and taking limit $\rho\to 0$, and using $u_k\in\mathcal{N}_{\lambda,M}$, we get

$$\langle J'_{\lambda,M}(u_k),f\rangle\leq\frac{1}{k}\left(\|u_k\|\|\xi_k'(0)\|_*+1\right)\leq\frac{1}{k}\frac{C_4\|f\|}{K}, \tag{3.24}$$

by Lemma 3.9 and (3.22). This completes the proof of Proposition. □

We can now prove the following:

Lemma 3.13 *Let $\beta<\frac{n}{n-1}$ and let λ satisfy (3.7). Then there exists a function $u_\lambda\in\mathcal{N}^+_{\lambda,M}\cap H^+$ such that $J_{\lambda,M}(u_\lambda)=\inf\limits_{u\in\mathcal{N}_{\lambda,M}\setminus\{0\}}J_{\lambda,M}(u)$.*

Proof. Let $\{u_k\}$ be a minimizing sequence for $J_{\lambda,M}$ on $\mathcal{N}_{\lambda,M}\setminus\{0\}$ satisfying (3.18) and (3.19). Then $\{u_k\}$ is bounded in $W_0^{1,n}(\Omega)$. Also there exists a subsequence of $\{u_k\}$ (still denoted by $\{u_k\}$) and a function u_λ such that $u_k\rightharpoonup u_\lambda$ weakly in $W_0^{1,n}(\Omega)$, $u_k\to u_\lambda$ strongly

in $L^\alpha(\Omega)$ for all $\alpha \geq 1$ and $u_k(x) \to u_\lambda(x)$ a.e in Ω. Also $\int_\Omega h|u_k|^{q+1} \to \int_\Omega h|u_\lambda|^{q+1}$ and by the compactness of Moser-Trudinger imbedding for $\beta < \frac{n}{n-1}$, $\int_\Omega f(u_k)(u_k - u_\lambda) \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$. Then by Lemma 3.12, we have $J'_{\lambda,M}(u_k - u_\lambda) \to 0$. We conclude that

$$m(\|u_k\|^n) \int_\Omega |\nabla u_k|^{n-2}\nabla u_k(\nabla u_k - \nabla u_\lambda) \to 0.$$

On the other hand, using $u_k \rightharpoonup u_\lambda$ weakly and boundedness of $m(\|u_k\|^n)$,

$$m(\|u_k\|^n) \int_\Omega |\nabla u_\lambda|^{n-2}\nabla u_\lambda(\nabla u_k - \nabla u_\lambda) \to 0 \text{ as } k \to \infty.$$

From above two equations and inequality (2.28), we have

$$m(\|u_k\|^n) \int_\Omega |\nabla u_k - \nabla u_\lambda|^n \to 0 \text{ as } k \to \infty.$$

Since $m(t) \geq m_0$, we obtain $u_k \to u_\lambda$ strongly in $W_0^{1,n}(\Omega)$ and hence $\|u_k\| \to \|u_\lambda\|$ strongly as $k \to \infty$. In particular, it follows that u_λ solves $(P_{\lambda,M})$ and hence $u_\lambda \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda,M}$. Moreover, $\theta_\lambda \leq J_{\lambda,M}(u_\lambda) \leq \liminf_{k\to\infty} J_{\lambda,M}(u_k) = \theta_\lambda$. Hence u_λ is a minimizer for $J_{\lambda,M}$ on $\mathcal{N}_{\lambda,M}$.
Using (3.21), we have $\int_\Omega h|u_\lambda|^{q+1} > 0$. Therefore there exists $t_1(u_\lambda)$ such that $t_1(u_\lambda)u_\lambda \in \mathcal{N}^+_{\lambda,M}$. We now claim that $t_1(u_\lambda) = 1$ (*i.e.* $u_\lambda \in \mathcal{N}^+_{\lambda,M}$). Suppose $t_1(u_\lambda) < 1$. Then $t_2(u_\lambda) = 1$ and hence $u_\lambda \in \mathcal{N}^-_{\lambda,M}$. Now $J_{\lambda,M}(t_1(u_\lambda)u_\lambda) \leq J_{\lambda,M}(u_\lambda) = \theta_{\lambda,M}$ which is impossible, as $t_1(u_\lambda)u_\lambda \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda,M}$. □

Theorem 3.14 *Let $\beta < \frac{n}{n-1}$ and let λ be such that (3.7) holds. Then $u_\lambda \in \mathcal{N}^+_{\lambda,M} \cap H^+$ is also a non-negative local minimum for $J_{\lambda,M}$ in $W_0^{1,n}(\Omega)$.*

Proof. Since $u_\lambda \in \mathcal{N}^+_{\lambda,M}$, we have $t_1(u_\lambda) = 1 < t_*(u_\lambda)$. Hence by continuity of $u \mapsto t_*(u)$, given $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta = \delta(\epsilon) > 0$ such that $1 + \epsilon < t_*(u_\lambda - w)$ for all $\|w\| < \delta$. Also, from Lemma 3.11 we have, for $\delta > 0$ small enough, we obtain a C^1 map $t : \mathbf{B}(0,\delta) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $t(w)(u_\lambda - w) \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda,M}$, $t(0) = 1$. Therefore, for $\delta > 0$ small enough we have $t_1(u_\lambda - w) = t(w) < 1 + \epsilon < t_*(u_\lambda - w)$ for all $\|w\| < \delta$. Since $t_*(u_\lambda - w) > 1$, we obtain $J_{\lambda,M}(u_\lambda) < J_{\lambda,M}(t_1(u_\lambda - w)(u_\lambda - w)) < J_{\lambda,M}(u_\lambda - w)$ for all $\|w\| < \delta$. This shows that u_λ is a local minimizer for $J_{\lambda,M}$.
Now we show that u_λ is a non-negative local minimum for $J_{\lambda,M}$ on $W_0^{1,n}(\Omega)$. If $u_\lambda \geq 0$ then we are done, otherwise, if $u_\lambda \ngeq 0$ then we take $\tilde{u_\lambda} = t_1(|u_\lambda|)|u_\lambda|$ which is non negative function in $\mathcal{N}^+_{\lambda,M} \cap H^+$. As $\psi_{u_\lambda}(t) = \psi_{|u_\lambda|}(t)$ so $t_*(|u_\lambda|) = t_*(u_\lambda)$ and $t_1(u_\lambda) \leq t_1(|u_\lambda|)$. Hence $t_1(|u_\lambda|) \geq 1$. Also $|u_\lambda| \in H^+$ then from Lemma 3.5 we have $J_{\lambda,M}(\tilde{u_\lambda}) \leq J_{\lambda,M}(|u_\lambda|) \leq J_{\lambda,M}(u_\lambda)$. Hence $\tilde{u_\lambda}$ minimize $J_{\lambda,M}$ on $\mathcal{N}_{\lambda,M} \setminus \{0\}$. Thus we can proceed same as earlier to show that $\tilde{u_\lambda}$ is a local minimum for $J_{\lambda,M}$ on $W_0^{1,n}(\Omega)$. □

Lemma 3.15 *Let $\beta < \frac{n}{n-1}$ and let λ be such that (3.7) holds. Then $J_{\lambda,M}$ achieve its minimizers on $\mathcal{N}^-_{\lambda,M}$.*

Proof. We note that $\mathcal{N}^-_{\lambda,M}$ is a closed set, as $t^-(u)$ is a continuous function of u and $J_{\lambda,M}$ is bounded below on $\mathcal{N}^-_{\lambda,M}$. Therefore, by Ekeland's Variational principle, we can find a sequence $\{v_k\} \in \mathcal{N}^-_{\lambda,M}$ such that

$$J_{\lambda,M}(v_k) \leq \inf_{u\in\mathcal{N}^-_{\lambda,M}} J_{\lambda,M}(u) + \frac{1}{k},\ \ J_{\lambda,M}(v) \geq J_{\lambda,M}(v_k) - \frac{1}{k}\|v - v_k\| \text{ for all } v \in \mathcal{N}^-_{\lambda,M}.$$

Then $\{v_k\}$ is a bounded sequence in $W^{1,n}_0(\Omega)$ and is easy to see that $v_k \in \Lambda \setminus \{0\}$. Thus by Lemma 3.10 and following the proof of Lemma 3.12, we get $\|J'_{\lambda,M}(v_k)\|_* \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$. Thus following the proof as in Lemma 3.13, we have $v_\lambda \in \mathcal{N}^-_{\lambda,M}$, weak limit of sequence $\{v_k\}$, is a solution of $(P_{\lambda,M})$. And moreover $v_\lambda \not\equiv 0$, as $\mathcal{N}^0_{\lambda,M} = \{0\}$. □

Proof of Theorem 3.1: Now the proof follows from Lemmas 3.13 and 3.15. □

To obtain the existence result in the critical case, we need the following compactness Lemma.

Lemma 3.16 *Suppose $\{u_k\}$ be a sequence in $W^{1,n}_0(\Omega)$ such that*

$$J'_{\lambda,M}(u_k) \to 0\ \ J_{\lambda,M}(u_k) \to c < \frac{1}{2n} m_0 \alpha_n^{n-1} - C\lambda^{\frac{p+2+\beta}{p+1-q+\beta}},$$

where C is a positive constant depending on p, q and n. Then there exists a strongly convergent subsequence.

Proof. By Lemma 2.7, there exists a subsequence $\{u_k\}$ of $\{u_k\}$ such that $u_k \to u$ in $L^\alpha(\Omega)$ for all α, $u_k(x) \to u(x)$ a.e. in Ω, $\nabla u_k(x) \to \nabla u(x)$ a.e. in Ω and $|\nabla u_k|^{n-2}\nabla u_k \rightharpoonup |\nabla u|^{n-2}\nabla u$ weakly in $W^{1,n}_0(\Omega)$. Now by concentration compactness lemma, $|\nabla u_k|^n \to \mu_1$, $g(u_k)u_k \to \mu_2$ in measure.
Let $B = \{x \in \overline{\Omega} :\ \exists\ r = r(x),\ \mu_1(\mathbf{B}_r \cap \Omega) < (\alpha_n)^{n-1}\}$ and let $A = \overline{\Omega}\backslash B$. Then as in Lemma 2.7, we can show that A is finite set say $\{x_1, x_2, ...x_m\}$. Since $J'_{\lambda,M}(u_k) \to 0$, we have

$$0 = \lim_{k\to\infty} \langle J'_{\lambda,M}(u_k), \phi\rangle = \lim_{k\to\infty} m(\|u_k\|^n) \int_\Omega |\nabla u_k|^{n-2}\nabla u_k \nabla\phi - \lambda \int_\Omega |u_k|^{q-1}u_k\phi - \int_\Omega g(u_k)\phi \quad (3.25)$$

$$0 = \lim_{k\to\infty} \langle J'_{\lambda,M}(u_k), u_k\phi\rangle = \lim_{k\to\infty} m(\|u_k\|^n) \left(\int_\Omega |\nabla u_k|^{n-2}\nabla u_k \nabla\phi u_k + \int_\Omega |\nabla u_k|^n \phi\right)$$
$$- \lambda \int_\Omega |u|^{q+1}\phi - \lim_{k\to\infty} \int_\Omega g(u_k)u_k\phi \quad (3.26)$$

$$0 = \lim_{k\to\infty} \langle J'_{\lambda,M}(u_k), u\phi\rangle = \lim_{k\to\infty} m(\|u_k\|^n) \left(\int_\Omega |\nabla u_k|^{n-2}\nabla u_k \nabla u\phi + \int_\Omega |\nabla u_k|^{n-2}\nabla u_k \nabla\phi u\right)$$
$$- \lambda \int_\Omega |u|^{q+1}\phi - \int_\Omega g(u)u\phi \quad (3.27)$$

Substituting (3.27) in (3.26), we have

$$\int_\Omega g(u_k)u_k\phi = m(\|u_k\|^n) \int_\Omega (|\nabla u_k|^n - |\nabla u_k|^{n-2}\nabla u_k \nabla u)\phi + \int_\Omega g(u)u\phi \quad (3.28)$$

Now take cut-off function $\psi_\delta \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ such that $\psi_\delta(x) \equiv 1$ in $\mathbf{B}_\delta(x_j)$, and $\psi_\delta(x) \equiv 0$ in $\mathbf{B}^c_{2\delta}(x_j)$ with $|\psi_\delta| \leq 1$. Then taking $\phi = \psi_\delta$,

$$0 \leq \left| \int_\Omega |\nabla u_k|^{n-2} \nabla u_k \nabla u \phi \right| \leq \left(\int_\Omega |\nabla u_k|^n \right)^{(n-1)/n} \left(\int_{\mathbf{B}_{2\delta}} |\nabla u|^n \right)^{1/n} \to 0 \text{ as } \delta \to 0.$$

Hence from (3.28), we get

$$\int_\Omega \phi d\mu_2 \geq m_0 \int_\Omega \phi d\mu_1 + \int_\Omega g(u) u \phi \text{ as } \delta \to 0. \tag{3.29}$$

Now as in Lemma 2.7, we can show that for any relatively compact set $K \subset \Omega_\epsilon$, where $\Omega_\epsilon = \Omega \setminus \cup_{i=1}^m \mathbf{B}_\delta(x_i)$

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \int_K g(u_k) u_k \to \int_K g(u) u.$$

Also taking $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$ and $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $\phi \equiv 1$ in $\mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)$ and $\phi \equiv 0$ in $\bar{\Omega} \setminus \mathbf{B}_1(0)$. Take $\psi_\epsilon = 1 - \sum_{j=1}^m \phi\left(\frac{x - x_j}{\epsilon}\right)$ in (3.29). Then $0 \leq \psi_\epsilon \leq 1$, $\psi_\epsilon \equiv 1$ in $\bar{\Omega}_\epsilon = \bar{\Omega} \setminus \cup_{j=1}^m \mathbf{B}_\epsilon(x_j)$,$\psi_\epsilon \equiv 0$ in $\cup_{j=1}^m \mathbf{B}_{\epsilon/2}(x_j)$

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega \psi_\epsilon d\mu_2 &= \lim_{\epsilon\to 0} \left(\int_{\Omega_\epsilon} \psi_\epsilon d\mu_2 + \sum_{i=1}^m \int_{\mathbf{B}_\epsilon \cap \Omega} \psi_\epsilon d\mu_2 \right) = \lim_{\epsilon\to 0} \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} g(u) u \psi_\epsilon + \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \delta_{x_i} \\ &= \int_\Omega g(u) u + \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \delta_{x_i}.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, from (3.29), we get

$$m_0 \int_\Omega \psi_\epsilon d\mu_1 \leq \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \delta_{x_i}. \tag{3.30}$$

Now choosing $\epsilon \to 0$, we get

$$m_0 \mu_1(A) \leq \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i.$$

Therefore from the definition of A, either $\beta_i = 0$ or $\beta_i \geq m_0(\alpha_n)^{n-1}$. Now we will show that $\beta_i = 0$, for all i. Suppose not, Now using $J_{\lambda,M}(u_k) \to c$ implies

$$\begin{aligned}nc =& J_{\lambda,M}(u_k) - \frac{1}{2}\langle J'_{\lambda,M}(u_k) u_k \rangle \\ =& \left(M(\|u_k\|^n) - \frac{1}{2} m(\|u_k\|^n) \|u_k\|^n \right) + \int_\Omega \left(\frac{1}{2} g(u_k) u_k - n G(u_k) \right) \\ &+ \lambda \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{n}{q+1} \right) \int_\Omega h|u|^{q+1} \\ \geq& \frac{m_0(\alpha_n)^{n-1}}{2} + \int_\Omega \left(\frac{1}{2} g(u) u - n G(u) \right) + \lambda \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{n}{q+1} \right) \int_\Omega h|u|^{q+1}.\end{aligned}$$

Then using equation (3.13), we have

$$\begin{aligned} c \geq & \frac{1}{2n} m_0 (\alpha_n)^{n-1} + \left(\frac{1}{2n} - \frac{1}{p+2}\right) \int_\Omega |u|^{p+2+\beta} + \lambda \left(\frac{1}{2n} - \frac{1}{q+1}\right) \int_\Omega h|u|^{q+1} \\ \geq & \frac{1}{2n} m_0 (\alpha_n)^{n-1} + \left(\frac{1}{2n} - \frac{1}{p+2}\right) \int_\Omega |u|^{(q+1)k} - \frac{\lambda(2n-1-q) l^{\frac{k-1}{k}}}{2n(q+1)} \left(\int_\Omega |u|^{(q+1)k}\right)^{\frac{1}{k}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $k = \frac{p+1+\beta}{q+1}$. Now as in Theorem 3.7, consider the global minimum of the function $\rho(x) : \mathbb{R}^+ \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defines as

$$\rho(x) = \left(\frac{1}{2n} - \frac{1}{p+2}\right) x^k - \left(\frac{\lambda(2n-q-1) l^{\frac{k-1}{k}}}{2n(q+1)}\right) x.$$

Then it can be shown that ρ attains its minimum value at $x = \left(\frac{\lambda(2n-q-1)(p+2) l^{\frac{k-1}{k}}}{k(q+1)(p+2-2n)}\right)^{\frac{1}{k-1}}$ and its minimum value is $-C(p,q,n)\lambda^{\frac{k}{k-1}}$, where $C(p,q,n) = \left(\frac{1}{k^{\frac{1}{k-1}}} - \frac{1}{k^{\frac{k}{k-1}}}\right) \frac{l (p+2)^{\frac{1}{k-1}} (2n-q-1)^{\frac{k}{k-1}}}{2n (p+2-2n)^{\frac{1}{k-1}} (q+1)^{\frac{k}{k-1}}} > 0$. Therefore, $c \geq \frac{1}{2n} m_0 (\alpha_n)^{n-1} - C(p,q,n)\lambda^{\frac{p+2+\beta}{p+1-q+\beta}}$. □

Let $\lambda_{00} = \max\{\lambda : \theta_{\lambda,M} \leq \frac{1}{2n} m_0 \alpha_n^{n-1} - C\lambda^{\frac{p+2+\beta}{p+1-q+\beta}}\}$ where C is as in the above Lemma.

Proof of Theorem 3.2: Let $\{u_k\}$ be a minimizing sequence for $J_{\lambda,M}$ on $\mathcal{N}_{\lambda,M} \setminus \{0\}$ satisfying (3.19). Then it is easy to see that $\{u_k\}$ is a bounded sequence in $W_0^{1,n}(\Omega)$. Also there exists a subsequence of $\{u_k\}$ (still denoted by $\{u_k\}$) and a function u_λ such that $u_k \rightharpoonup u_\lambda$ weakly in $W_0^{1,n}(\Omega)$, $u_k \to u_\lambda$ strongly in $L^\alpha(\Omega)$ for all $\alpha \geq 1$ and $u_k(x) \to u_\lambda(x)$ a.e in Ω. Then by Lemma 3.12, we have $J'_{\lambda,M}(u_k - u_\lambda) \to 0$.

Now by compactness Lemma 3.16, $u_k \to u_\lambda$ strongly in $W_0^{1,n}(\Omega)$ and hence $\|u_k\| \to \|u_\lambda\|$ strongly as $k \to \infty$. In particular, it follows that u_λ solves $(P_{\lambda,M})$ and hence $u_\lambda \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda,M}$. Also we can show similarly as in Lemma 3.13 and Theorem 3.14 that $u_\lambda \in \mathcal{N}^+_{\lambda,M} \cap H^+$ is a non-negative local minimizer of $J_{\lambda,M}$ in $W_0^{1,n}(\Omega)$. □

Acknowledgements: Third author's research is supported by National Board for Higher Mathematics, Govt. of India, grant number: 2/48(12)/2012/NBHM(R.P.)/R&D II/13095.

References

[1] Adimurthi, *Existence of positive solutions of the semilinear Dirichlet problem with critical growth for the n-Laplacian*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci., 17 (1990) 393-413.

[2] Adimurthi and K. Sandeep, *A singular Moser-Trudinger embedding and its applications,* NoDEA Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl. 13 (2007) 585-603.

[3] C. O. Alves, F. J. S. A. Corrêa and G. M. Figueiredo, *On a class of nonlocal elliptic problems with critical growth*, DEA 2 (2010) 409-417.

[4] C. O. Alves, F. J. S. A. Corrêa and T. F. Ma, *Positive solutions for a quasilinear elliptic equation of Kirchhoff type*, Comput. Math. Appl. 49 (2005) 85-93.

[5] C. O. Alves and A. El Hamidi, *Nehari manifold and existence of positive solutions to a class of quasilinear problem*, Nonlinear Anal. 60 (4) (2005) 611-624.

[6] A. Ambrosetti, H. Brezis and G. Cerami, *Combined effects of concave and convex nonlinearities in some elliptic problems*, J. Funct. Anal. 122 (2) (1994) 519-543.

[7] K. J. Brown and Y. Zhang, *The Nehari manifold for a semilinear elliptic problem with a sign-changing weight function*, J. Differential Equations, 193 (2003) 481-499.

[8] K. J. Brown and T. F. Wu, *A fibering map approach to a semilinear elliptic boundry value problem*, Electronic Journal of Differential Equations 69 (2007) 1-9.

[9] C. Chen, Y. Kuo and T. Wu, *The Nehari manifold for a Kirchhoff type problem involving sign-changing weight functions,* J. Differ. Equ. 250 (4) (2011) 1876-1908.

[10] B. T. Cheng, X. Wu and J. Liu, *Multiple solutions for a class of Kirchhoff type problems with concave nonlinearity,* Nonlinear Differ. Equ. Appl. 19 (5) (2012) 521-537.

[11] B. T. Cheng and X. Wu, *Existence results of positive solutions of Kirchhoff problems*, Nonlinear Anal. 71 (2009) 4883-4892.

[12] C. S. Chen, J. C. Huang and L. H. Liu, *Multiple solutions to the nonhomogeneous p-Kirchhoff elliptic equation with concave-convex nonlinearities,* Appl. Math. Lett. 26 (7) (2013) 754-759.

[13] M. Chipot and B. Lovat, *Some remarks on nonlocal elliptic and parabolic problems,* Nonlinear Anal. 30 (7) (1997) 4619-4627.

[14] F. J. S. A. Corrêa and G. M. Figueiredo, *On an elliptic equation of p-Kirchhoff-type via variational methods,* Bull. Austral. Math. Soc. 77 (2006) 263-277.

[15] F. J. S. A. Corrêa, *On positive solutions of nonlocal and nonvariational elliptic problems, Nonlinear Anal.* 59 (2004) 1147-1155.

[16] D. G. de Figueiredo, O. H. Miyagaki, and B. Ruf, *Elliptic equations in* $\mathbb{R}^2$ *with nonlinearities in the critical growth range,* Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations 3 (2) (1995) 139-153.

[17] P. Drabek and S. I. Pohozaev, *Positive solutions for the p-Laplacian: application of the fibering method*, Proc. Royal Soc. Edinburgh Sect A 127 (1997) 703-726.

[18] A. El Hamidi, *Multiple solutions with changing sign energy to a nonlinear elliptic equation*, Commun. Pure Appl. Anal. 3 (2004) 253-265.

[19] G. M. Figueiredo, *Ground state soluttion for a Kirchhoff problem with exponential critical growth*, arXiv:1305.2571v1[math.AP].

[20] J. Giacomoni, and K. Sreenadh, *A multiplicity result to a nonhomogeneous elliptic equation in whole space* $\mathbb{R}^2$*,* Adv. Math. Sci. Appl. 15 (2) (2005) 467-488.

[21] J. Giacomoni, S. Prashanth and K. Sreenadh, *A global multiplicity result for* N*-Laplacian with critical nonlinearity of concave-convex type*, J. Differ. Equ. 232 (2007) 544-572.

[22] X. He and W. Zou *Existence of a positive solution to Kirchhoff type problems without compactness conditions,* J. Differ. Equ. 253 (7) (2012) 2285-2294.

[23] X. He and W. Zou, *Existence and concentration behavior of positive solutions for a Kirchhoff equation in* $\mathbb{R}^3$*,* J. Differ. Equ. 252 (2) (2012) 1813-1834.

[24] Y. Li, F. Li and J. Shi, *Infinitely many positive solutions for Kirchhoff-type problems*, Nonlinear Anal. 70 (2009) 1407-1414.

[25] P. L. Lions, *The concentration compactness principle in the calculus of variations part-I* Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana 1 (1985) 185-201.

[26] J. Marcos do Ó, *Semilinear Dirichlet problems for the* N*-Laplacian in* Ω *with nonlinearities in critical growth range*, Differential Integral Equations 9 (1996) 967-979.

[27] J. Moser, *A sharp form of an inequality by N. Trudinger*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. 20 (1971) 1077-1092.

[28] S. Prashanth and K. Sreenadh, *Multiplicity of Solutions to a nonhomogeneous elliptic equation in* $\mathbb{R}^2$, Differential and Integral Equations 18 (2005) 681-698.

[29] G. Tarantello, *On nonhomogeneous elliptic equations involving critical Sobolev exponent*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincare- Anal. non lineaire 9 (1992) 281-304.

[30] T. F. Wu, *On semilinear elliptic equations involving concave-convex nonlinearities and sign-changing weight function*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., 318 (2006) 253-270.

[31] T. F. Wu, *Multiplicity results for a semilinear elliptic equation involving sign-changing weight function*, Rocky Mountain J. Math. 39 (3) (2009) 995-1011.

[32] T. F. Wu, *Multiple positive solutions for a class of concave-convex elliptic problems in* Ω *involving sign-changing weight*, J. Funct. Anal. 258 (1) (2010) 99-131.